



PEETERS

BYZANTINE EROTAPOCRITIC LITERATURE IN SLAVONIC TRANSLATION WITH SPECIAL ATTENTION TO THE IMPORTANT ROLE PLAYED BY ANASTASIUS SINAITA'S "INTERROGATIONES ET RESPONSIONES" IN THE CONVERSION OF THE SLAVS

Author(s): Francis J. Thomson

Source: *Byzantion*, 2014, Vol. 84 (2014), pp. 385-432

Published by: Peeters Publishers

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/44173410>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Peeters Publishers is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Byzantion*

BYZANTINE EROTAPOCRITIC LITERATURE
IN SLAVONIC TRANSLATION
WITH SPECIAL ATTENTION TO THE IMPORTANT ROLE
PLAYED BY ANASTASIUS SINAITA'S
INTERROGATIONES ET RESPONSIONES
IN THE CONVERSION OF THE SLAVS

The aim of this brief survey of erotapocritic works translated into Slavonic is to inform scholars interested in erotapocritic literature who are not Slavists about the not insignificant role that it played in the development of mediaeval Orthodox Slav culture and for this purpose it is necessary to begin with a short outline of the three principal stages in the Slav reception of Byzantine culture. The first major effort to convert the Slavs came from the West when Iroscottish missionaries under the jurisdiction of Bishop Virgilius (Fergal) of Salzburg (749-784) worked among the Slovenes of Carinthia. However, Virgil was succeeded by the Frank Arno (785-821), whose see was raised to an archsee in 798 with five suffragan bishoprics. To counter the ever increasing Frankish pressure Prince Rastislav of Moravia (846-870) in 862/3 sent an embassy to Constantinople with a request for a teacher for his newly converted people and the result was the dispatch of the brothers Cyril († 869) and Methodius († 885) to Moravia in late 863, who introduced the use of Slavonic into the liturgy. In 869 Methodius was appointed archbishop of Sirmium by Pope Hadrian II (867-872) but despite the fact that Hadrian's successor, John VIII (872-882), in his epistle *Industriae tuae* of 880 to Rastislav's successor, Svatopluk (870-894), specifically endorsed the use of Slavonic in the liturgy,¹ after Methodius' death his disciples were expelled from Moravia, many of them going to Bulgaria. The use of Slavonic in the liturgy and as a literary language thus came to an end among the West Slavs, although its use in the liturgy had already penetrated to the South Slavs in Dalmatia and part of Croatia, where it survived until the twentieth century despite occasional expressions of official disapproval.² The West

¹ Ed. F. GRIVEC - F. TOMŠIČ, *Constantinus et Methodius Thessalonicensis. Fontes (Radovi Staroslavenskog instituta, 4)*, Zagreb, 1960, pp. 72-73. The epistle, which has rightly been termed "la charte de l'égalité des langues devant Dieu", see A. LAPÔTRE, *L'Europe et le Saint-Siège à l'époque carolingienne*, vol. 1, Paris, 1895, p. 126, is often incorrectly referred to as a bull.

² Already in c. 925 Pope John X expressed strong disapproval of the use of Slavonic in the liturgy; on this see F. THOMSON, *The Legacy of SS. Cyril and Methodius in the Counter-*

Slavs thus shared the same cultural development as the rest of Western Europe and when vernacular translations began to be made they were in the vernacular even in Dalmatia and Croatia, viz. in Croat, not Slavonic, e.g. the translation of Gregory the Great's *Dialogi* made in 1513 from the Italian (Tuscan) version of Domenico Cavalca (c. 1270-1342).³

The history of the South Slavs (except the Croats) and the East Slavs followed an entirely different path. There were two main periods in the reception of Byzantine culture, which approximately coincide with the two Bulgarian Empires. The first period began with the baptism of Khan Boris of Bulgaria (852-889) in 864/5 and lasted until the incorporation of Bulgaria into the Byzantine Empire, first Eastern Bulgaria in 971 and then Western Bulgaria (Macedonia) in 1018. During this period the foundations of the assimilation of Byzantine culture by the Slavs through the medium of translations into Slavonic were laid. There is no evidence that during the period of Byzantine occupation in the eleventh and twelfth centuries the authorities pursued a deliberate policy of suppressing Slavonic culture but the assimilation of Byzantine culture by new translations was undoubtedly considerably slowed.⁴

A Bulgarian revolt against Byzantine rule began in 1185 and on 8 November 1204 Kaloyan (1197-1207) was crowned tsar in the new capital of Tŕrnovo, an act which symbolizes the beginning of the second period of assimilation of Byzantine culture through the medium of translations. It was only now that the Serbs, who had been converted largely via Bulgaria, came to form an independent state under Satrap (Župan) Stephen Nemanja (c. 1168-1195), whose youngest son Rastislav, in religion Sabas, was consecrated the first archbishop of Serbia (1219-1234, † 1235/6). During the fourteenth century the translations included many of the works by Hesychasts and the Fathers who had inspired them. The Second Bulgarian Empire came to an end with the capture of Tŕrnovo on 17 July 1393 by Sultan Bayezid I (1389-1403) and it was only in 1878 that part of Bulgaria again became independent. It is true that some translation activity continued in the fifteenth

Reformation, in E. KONSTANTINOU (ed.), *Methodios und Kyrillos in ihrer europäischen Dimension (Philhellenische Studien, 10)*, Frankfurt am Main, 2005, pp. 86-89; on the important role which the Slavo-Latin rite in Dalmatia and Croatia played in the Counter-Reformation see *ibidem*, pp. 104-151.

³ The Croat translation has been edited by J. HAMM, *Dijalozi Grgura Velikoga u prijevodu iz godine 1513 (Stari pisci hrvatski, 38)*, Zagreb, 1978, pp. 67-223.

⁴ For a brief survey of translation activity during the two centuries of Byzantine hegemony see F. THOMSON, *Continuity in the Development of Bulgarian Culture during the Period of Byzantine Hegemony and the Slavonic Translations of the Three Cappadocian Fathers*, in H. КОЧЕВ (ed.), *Международен Симпозиум 1100 години от блажената скончина на св. Методиѝ*, vol. 1, София, 1989, pp. 140-153.

century but the rump Serbian state barely outlived the fall of Constantinople on 29 May 1453 and in 1459 the last ruler of Serbia, Despot Stephen Branković (1458-1459, † 1474), went into exile and the incorporation of Serbia into the Ottoman Empire symbolizes, if not the end of the process of cultural assimilation by translations, then at the least its reduction to a much lower level of activity.

In 988/9 Prince Vladimir of Kiev (980-1015) had married Basil II's sister Anna († 1011) and converted to Christianity but Russia – despite claims to the contrary – played a relatively minor role in the assimilation of Byzantine culture mainly because there was no direct contact with Byzantium and few East Slavs knew literary as opposed to demotic Greek.⁵ There is no evidence for any great metaphrastic activity in Russia and the country, whose church was headed by Greek metropolitans until the mid fourteenth century, was mainly the recipient of the translations made in the Balkans, although East Slavs resident in the Byzantine Empire, above all on Athos, were among the translators.

The period of the Cyrillo-Methodian mission (863-885) had been too brief to allow of the translation of many texts. According to the *vita* of Methodius only the Psalms, Gospels, Acts and Epistles and some liturgical services had been translated before Cyril died during a visit to Rome in 869. Later Methodius translated the rest of the Bible except for Maccabees, a nomocanon and “book(s) of the fathers”.⁶ The basis of the Moravian nomocanon, which only survives in two manuscripts of the thirteenth century, was John Scholasticus' *Synagoge L titulorum* (CPG 7550) and one of the appendices in both codices is Timothy of Alexandria's *Responsa canonica* (CPG 2520), which is by some considered to be an early addition made to the nomocanon in Bulgaria, but in either case it is one of the first erotapocritic works translated into Slavonic.⁷ The identity of the “book(s) of the

⁵ On the knowledge of demotic Greek in Russia see F. THOMSON, *Communications orales et écrites entre Grecs et Russes (IX^e-XIII^e siècles). Russes à Byzance, Grecs en Russie: Connaissance et méconnaissance de la langue de l'autre*, in A. DIERKENS - J.-M. SANSTERRE (eds), avec la collaboration de J.-L. KUPPER, *Voyages et voyageurs à Byzance et en Occident du VI^e au XI^e siècle. Actes du colloque international organisé par la Section d'Histoire de l'Université de Liège (5-7 mai 1994) (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, cclxxviii)*, Geneva, 2000, pp. 113-163.

⁶ Methodius' *vita* ed. GRIVEC - TOMŠIČ, *Constantinus et Methodius* [see note 1], pp. 147-166, see p. 164: *ot'č'skya k"nigy*. Since the Slavonic word for book, *k"nigy*, is *plurale tantum*, it can equally mean book or books. The phrase can also be understood in the sense of “patristic book(s)”.

⁷ The two manuscripts are *codex* 230 of the thirteenth century in the collection of Count Nikolay Rumyantsev and *codex* 54 of the sixteenth in the collection of Moscow Theological Academy, both in the State Library of Russia at Moscow; on them see И. СРЕЗНЕВСКИЙ, *Обозрение древних русских списков кормчей книги*, in *Сборник Отделения русского*

fathers” is much disputed but most scholars consider that it means a patericon, although there is no agreement as to which.⁸ The most favoured one is Gregory the Great’s erotapocritic *Dialogorum libri IV. De vita et miraculis patrum italicorum et de aeternitate animarum* (BHL 6542; CPL 1713) since it has the peculiarity that although it was translated from the Greek version made by Pope Zacharius (741-752) (BHG 1446+273+1447-1448) the first part of the preface was clearly translated from Latin.⁹ Even if the translation was not made in Moravia there can be no doubt but that it is among the earliest Slavonic translations. Some scholars consider that the patericon translated by Methodius was the *Patericon systematicum* (BHG 1442v; CPG 5562), known in Slavonic as the *Patericon sceticum* (CPG 5610), one of the two main collections of the largely erotapocritic *Apophthegmata patrum*, devoted to the question Πῶς σωθῶ; It seems, however, more likely that this patericon was translated in Bulgaria no later than in the late ninth or early tenth century. It exists in two recensions, a longer and a shorter, both so early that it is disputed whether the shorter is an abridgment of the longer or the latter an expansion of the former. The earliest manuscripts of the longer recension are of the thirteenth century, e.g. Serbian *codex* 86 in the collection of the monastery of the Ascension at Peć,¹⁰ whereas the earliest manuscripts of the shorter are of the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century, e.g. *codex Vindobonensis slavicus* 152.¹¹

языка и словесности Императорской Академии наук, 65, 2 (1897), pp. 113-134, and В. БЕНЕШЕВИЧ, *Синагога в 50 титулов и другие юридические сборники Иоанна Схоластика. К древнейшей истории источников права грековосточной церкви*, in *Записки Императорского Археологического общества*, 8 (1914), pp. 199-212. The Slavonic translation of John’s *Synagoge L titulorum* has been published, ed. K. HADERKA, *Nomokanon*, in L. HAVLÍK (ed.), *Magnae Moraviae Fontes historici*, 4 (*Opera Universitatis Purkynianae Brunensis. Facultas philosophica*, 156), Brno, 1971, pp. 246-363, but not this version of Timothy’s *Responsa*. For the later translations of Timothy’s *Responsa* see below.

⁸ For a recent survey of the various opinions see C. DIDD, *I Dialogi di Gregorio Magno nella Versione Antico-slava* (*Collana di Europa Orientalis*, 1), Rome, 2000, pp. 15-27.

⁹ Ed. С. ДИДДИ, *Патерик римский. Диалоги Григория Великого в древнеславянском переводе (Памятники древней письменности)*, Москва, 2001, pp. 3-495; for the preface see pp. 3-5.

¹⁰ On the manuscript see B. JOVANOVIĆ, *Pečki paterik. Tri jezičke redakcije slovenskog prevoda Skitskog paterika*, in *Slovo*, 24 (1974), pp. 139-188. For a Glagolitic reconstruction of the original translation in the longer recension on the basis of thirty Cyrillic manuscripts with the Cyrillic text in parallel see У. ФЕДЕР, *Скитский патерик. Славянский перевод в принятом тексте и в реконструкции архетипа* (*Pegasus Oost-Europese Studies*, 14), Amsterdam, 2012, pp. 9-749; for incipitaria of its entries see У. ФЕДЕР, *Хиляда години като един ден. Животът на текстовете в православното славянство*, София, 2005, pp. 259-284, and W. VEDER, *The Scete Paterikon. Introduction, Maps and Indices* (*Pegasus Oost-Europese Studies*, 12), Amsterdam, 2012, pp. 126-153.

¹¹ For an edition of the Vienna codex see N. VAN WIJK, *The Old Church Slavonic Translation of the Ἀνδρῶν ἁγίων βιβλος*, ed. D. ARMSTRONG - R. POPE - C. VAN SCHOONEVELD (*Slavistic Printings and Reprintings*, 1), The Hague, 1975, pp. 95-310.

However, the earliest witness to the translation is an East Slav manuscript copied in 1076 which contains two excerpts.¹²

The other main collection of the *Apophthegmata patrum*, which is divided into two parts, the *Patericon alphabeticum* (BHG 1443-1444c; CPG 5560 and 5611 [*versio palaeo-slavica*]) and the *Patericon anonymum*, (BHG 1445; CPG 5561), the latter known in Slavonic as the *Patericon hierosolymitanum* (CPG 5612), was translated in Bulgaria in about the mid tenth century and the earliest manuscripts are of the fourteenth century, e.g. Serbian *codex* 50 in the collection of Alexander Hilferding, now in the Russian National Library, Saint Petersburg.¹³ The translation is abridged in that very few of the entries of the second half of the anonymous part (cc. 18-40) were translated, whereas the first 17 cc. were translated in full. It has been suggested that this was because the translator did not wish to include *apophthegmata* which are also found in variant versions in the *Patericon systematicum*, but the question requires further study.¹⁴

¹² The manuscript is now *codex* 20 in the collection of the Hermitage, Saint Petersburg, and has been edited by М. МУШИНСКАЯ, Е. МИШИНА and В. ГОЛЫШЕНКО, *Изборник 1076 года (Памятники славяно-русской письменности. Новая серия)*, 2 vols, Москва, 2009, i, pp. 157-707; for the excerpts on ff. 239r-241r, see pp. 633-637; for the Greek originals see *ibidem*, ii, p. 76.

¹³ For a description of the manuscript see *Отчет Императорской Публичной Библиотеки за 1868 год*, С.-Петербург, 1869, pp. 99-102. The fate of this manuscript illustrates the consequences of Ottoman rule for South Slav culture in the nineteenth century. In 1858 Alexander Hilferding (1831-1872) undertook an expedition to study the situation of the Slav population in Bosnia and Hercegovina and whenever possible he acquired manuscripts. In the monastery of Michael the Archangel on the Tara near Kolašin, which had been sacked, he discovered a large number of manuscripts which had been left lying on the altar as valueless. He took the patericon and as many others as he could but, not having a cart, he left the rest, as he put it, "as food for the mice and mould or as pickings for a future traveller", see А. ГИЛЬФЕРДИНГ, *Путевые по Херцеговини, Босни и Старой Србији*, Београд, 1996, p. 210. No trace of the other manuscripts has been recorded.

¹⁴ For the suggestion see M. CAPALDO, *La tradizione slava della collezione alfabetico-anonima degli Apophthegmata patrum. (Prototipo greco e struttura della parte alfabetica)*, in *Ricerche slavistiche*, 22-23 (1975-1976), pp. 107-108. For an incipitarium of the entries in both the alphabetic and anonymous parts see Л. БЕЛОВА, *Азбучно-Иерусалимский патерик. Указатель начальных слов*, Санкт-Петербург, 1991, pp. 7-73. The alphabetical part was edited on the basis of *codex* 50 in the Hilferding collection together with the Greek text by Raffaele Caldarelli in his dissertation for Sapienza University of Rome, see R. CALDARELLI, *Il Paterik alfabetico-anonimo in traduzione antico-slava*, Rome, 1996, 1, i-iii, 118-170, 1-284, 1-212. Unfortunately it has not been published and the dissertation is not widely available; on the translation see also IDEM, *Kilka uwag o słownictwie Pateryka Alfabetycznego*, in A. ALBERTI et al. (ed.), *Contributi italiani al XIII Congresso internazionale degli Slavisti (Ljubljana 15-21 agosto 2003)*, Pisa, 2003, pp. 59-84. There is also a fourteenth-century Croat Slavonic translation in Latin Gothic script of a selection of 188 apophthegms but the selection was made and translated from the Latin versions (BHL 6525, 6527, 6529-6531; CPG 5570-5571, 5574) and is hence unrelated to the Slavonic translations in Cyrillic made from Greek; see the edition by D. MALIĆ, *Žića svetih otaca. Hrvatska srednjovjekovna proza*

One of the most important erotapocritic works translated at the time of the First Bulgarian Empire was the collection of *Quaestiones et responsiones* (CPG 7482), which is ascribed to Gregory of Nazianzus' brother Caesarius († 368/9) but is in fact of the mid sixth century. The 218 questions form a logical whole which deals firstly with the Trinity (QQ 2-8), then with Jesus' divine and human natures (QQ 9-41), the Holy Spirit (QQ 42-43), angels (QQ 44-50), creation (QQ 51-175) with sections on natural science (QQ 50-91), astronomy (QQ 92-117) and the nature and anatomy of man (QQ 136-158), as well as a number of questions on ἀπορίαι, 'difficult' passages in Scripture (QQ 180-197), so that the work includes information on a wide range of subjects including medicine and geography.¹⁵ As to be expected, the mention of the pagan ways of the Slavs in the response to Q 109 has attracted a considerable amount of interest among Slav scholars.¹⁶ Despite the fact that the Greek codex used for the translation was defective and the Slavonic text begins with Q 36, the ending of the final question is missing and there are also some minor omissions, the translation illustrates one of the characteristics of the Slavonic *corpus translationum* in that it is extremely literal and thus is of value in weighting Greek variants.¹⁷ It also illustrates the fact that some metaphrastic errors may not be due to the translator's failure to comprehend the Greek original but be the result of a corrupt Greek text, to give but one example, in Q 111 (Slav 112) ἐν μὲν τῇ Ἑρμουπόλει, for in Hermopolis, has become: *v moem ubo grade*, for in my city, viz. ἐν μὲν τῇ ἑμοῦ πόλει.¹⁸ Since the beginning was missing the

(*Hrvatska jezična baština*, 1), Zagreb, 1997, pp. 49-184, with also a facsimile edition, *ibidem*, pp. 187-454.

¹⁵ It has with some justice been called "fast eine Einführung in ein System christlicher Weltanschauung", see H. DÖRRIE - H. DÖRRIES, *Erotapokriseis*, in *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, vol. 6, Stuttgart, 1966, col. 356. The above numbers are those of the QQ in Greek, which are one lower than those in the Slavonic translation, which begins with Q 36 numbered 37.

¹⁶ The Greek text ed. R. RIEDINGER, *Pseudo-Kaisarios. Die Erotapokriseis* (*Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller*), Berlin, 1989, pp. 9-231, the translation ed. Я. МИЛТЕНОВ, *Диалозите на Псевдо-Кесарий в славянската ръкописна традиция*, София, 2006, pp. 331-533; for the mention of the Slavs in Q 109 see pp. 87 and 385 respectively; the studies devoted to this passage include I. ДУЈЧЕВ, *Medioevo bizantino-slavo*, i (*Storia e letteratura. Raccolta di studi e testi*, 105), Rome, 1965, pp. 23-43 and 543-544, and С. ЙОРДАНОВ, *Славяни и фисонити от "Диалози" на Псевдо-Кесарий и феноменът на ликантропията в славянското общество от времето на великото преселение на народите*, in Н. ДАСКАЛОВ *et al.* (ред.), *Славистични проучвания. Сборник в чест на XII Международен славистичен Конгрес*, Велико Търново, 1998, pp. 185-196.

¹⁷ See RIEDINGER, *Erotapokriseis* [see note 16], pp. X-XI, who calls it "äußerst wörtlich". On the relation of the Slavonic translation to the Greek see also IDEM, *Pseudo-Kaisarios. Überlieferungsgeschichte und Verfasserfrage* (*Byzantinisches Archiv*, 12), Munich, 1969, pp. 50-63, with a list of the omissions on p. 59.

¹⁸ Ed. МИЛТЕНОВ, *Диалозите* [see note 16], p. 390.

text had no title and so the translator added his own lengthy one, which begins: “Saint Sylvester’s and Blessed Anthony’s Explanation of the Holy Trinity and of All Creation [...]”.¹⁹ Several theories have been proposed to explain this title but they are all convoluted hypotheses and cannot be examined here. The translation also illustrates another characteristic of the *corpus translationum*: it was clearly made in Bulgaria in the late ninth or early tenth century but because of the ravages of wars in the Balkans it has only survived in East Slav manuscripts, the earliest of which are of the fifteenth century.²⁰

Another major work translated in the tenth century was the erotapocritic collection incorrectly attributed to Athanasius of Alexandria, *Ad Antiochum principem, de multis et necessariis quaestionibus in divina Scriptura controversis, quas nemo Christianus ignorare debet* (CPG 2257). It is a veritable medley of spiritual, exegetic and eschatological questions including some frankly bizarre ones which can be dismissed as *trivialia*, e.g. since nobody had died, from where did Cain learn how to kill Abel? (Q 57); if a man drowns and is eaten by fish, the fish by men, the men by lions, how is the man resurrected in his body (Q 114)? The textual tradition of the translation illustrates the difficulties often involved with the erotapocritic genre: well over a hundred manuscripts are known but not all have the same translation and the number of QQ varies considerably.²¹ The earliest complete manuscripts are Bulgarian of the fourteenth century and contain two variant recensions of the same translation, one with 128 QQ is found in a florilegium copied in 1348 for Tsar John Alexander of Bulgaria (1331-1371),²² the other with 112 QQ is in a Bulgarian florilegium of the late fourteenth century.²³ Already in the fifteenth century there is a conflation of the two with 136 QQ, although the number varies in later manuscripts.²⁴

¹⁹ For a German translation of the lengthy title see RIEDINGER, *Pseudo-Kaisarios* [see note 17], p. 51.

²⁰ On the manuscripts see МИЛТЕНОВ, *Диалогите* [see note 16], pp. 35-44.

²¹ For a list of 110 manuscripts see К. КУЕВ, *Иван Александровият сборник от 1348 г.*, София, 1981, pp. 219-244.

²² The collection is on ff. 105v-155r of the manuscript, now *codex F.I.376* in the Russian National Library, Saint Petersburg, ed. КУЕВ, *Иван* [see note 21], pp. 244-287; for QQ 57 and 114 (Slav 56 and 108) see pp. 262 and 282.

²³ The collection is ff. 148r-173v of the manuscript, now *codex slavicus IX F 15* in the National Museum, Prague; on the manuscript see А. ЯЦИМИРСКИЙ, *Описание южно-славянских и русских рукописей заграничных библиотек*, vol. i, Петроград, 1921, pp. 727-741, and J. VAŠICA - J. VAJS, *Soupis staroslovanských rukopisů Národního musea v Praze*, Prague, 1957, pp. 224-228. Except for a few minor fragments the collection remains unpublished.

²⁴ For an edition of a text with 133 QQ in the early eighteenth-century *codex 129/1064* in the collection of the monastery of the Transfiguration on Solovki Island see И. ПОРФИРЬЕВ,

However, the earliest witness to the translation is the above mentioned manuscript copied in 1076, not much more than a century after the translation was made, which contains a collection of 34 ἑρωταποκρίσεις, only 15 of which are Athanasian,²⁵ viz. QQ 113, 69, 19, 34, 77, 76, 74, 67, 15, 81, 124, 14, 130, 79 and 92, in that order, the first three of which are about death and the rest on sin and prayer.²⁶ As yet the relations between the many manuscripts with Athanasian QQ have not been studied and there must be at least two translations as a florilegium of the late twelfth or early thirteenth century, viz. *codex* 12 in the collection of the Trinity Laura of St Sergius, has QQ 5, 7, 10-11, 13 and 15 in a completely different translation.²⁷ Q 15 is – unlike the others – in a much expanded form and as such is frequently found by itself. Whether it is the translation of a variant Greek redaction or a Slav revision remains to be ascertained. A major role in the dissemination of the Athanasian collection was played by a popular homiletic collection known as the *Izmaragd*, i.e. *Smaragdus*, the first redaction of which was compiled for the edification of the laity in Russia in the fourteenth century. In some of the manuscripts the 67th entry is a collection of 71 QQ.²⁸ The second redaction of the *Izmaragd* of the late fifteenth century only contains 22 QQ, which are not grouped in one entry but spread over four, viz. № 80 with 11 QQ, viz. QQ 11, 19-20, 23, 25-26, 32, 35, 90-91 and 82; № 81 with 2 QQ, viz. QQ 71 and 69; № 112 with Q 113, and № 145 with 7 QQ, viz. QQ 15-16, 18, 33, 81, 83 and 87.²⁹

Апокрифические сказания о новозаветных лицах и событиях по рукописям Соловецкой библиотеки, in Сборник Отделения русского языка и словесности Императорской Академии наук, 62, 4 (1890), pp. 327-378.

²⁵ The term 'Athanasian' is used merely to avoid having to call them constantly 'Pseudo-Athanasian'.

²⁶ The folia of the manuscript, on which see above note 12, are in muddled order but the collection on ff. 114v-133v and 188r-227v has been edited in the correct order by МУШИНСКАЯ - МИШИНА - ГОЛЫШЕНКО, *Изборник* [see note 12], i, pp. 492-610; for the Athanasian QQ see pp. 505-518, 526-538 and 540-550.

²⁷ The codex, now in the State Library of Russia, Moscow, has been edited by J. POPOVSKI, F. THOMSON and W. VEDER, *The Troickij Sbornik (cod. Moskva, GBL, F. 304 (Troice-Sergieva Lavra) N 12). Text in Transcription (Polata knigopisnaja, 21-22)*, Nijmegen, 1988, pp. 1-202; for the QQ see pp. 188-193.

²⁸ See the list of the entries of the first redaction in В. ЯКОВЛЕВ, *К литературной истории древне-русских сборников. Опыт исследования "Измарагда"*, Одесса, 1893, pp. 9-26, for the 67th see p. 24.

²⁹ See the list of the entries of the second redaction *ibidem*, pp. 171-194, see pp. 182, 182-183, 186 and 191. In the case of entry 145 he claims, *ibidem* p. 191, that there are 8 questions and that the last is Q 101, but in fact it is Q 8 of the genuine collection of Anastasius Sinaita; on the latter collection see below.

The erotapocritic works translated during the First Bulgarian Empire include Theodoret of Cyrrhus' *Quaestiones in Octateuchum* (CPG 6200), the earliest manuscript of which is thirteenth-century *codex* II.6 in the collection of Count Fedor Tolstoy with 45 QQ,³⁰ but there are two larger selections in fifteenth-century manuscripts, one with seventy-seven ἐρωταποκρίσεις and the other with seventy, as well as several minor collections, which all go back to the same translation.³¹ As yet no QQ on the books of Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges or Ruth have been traced and it is possible that only the QQ on the first four Biblical books were translated.³² Erotapocritic collections of canon law include a second translation of Timothy's *Responsa canonica* as part of the *Nomocanon XIV titulorum*.³³ There are also erotapocritic apocryphal works such as the *Apocalypses Johannis prima* (BHG 921-922f; CCCA 331) and *tertia* (BHG 922k). These latter works were subject to alteration almost at scribal whim so that there are almost as many redactions as manuscripts.³⁴ Although *Dialogi* are not the same as collections of miscellaneous ἐρωταποκρίσεις, in so far as they are erotapocritic they must be included in any survey of erotapocritic literature. One such work translated at this time is the anonymous *Dialogus Timothei et Aquilae* (CPG 7794). Although the earliest traced manuscript is of the fifteenth century, viz. *codex* 881 in the collection of the Russian Synod, the language is clearly very early and a passage from

³⁰ The manuscript, now *codex* Q.p.I.18 in the Russian National Library, St Petersburg, has been edited by H. WATRÓBSKA, *The Izbornik of the XIIIth Century* (Cod. Leningrad, GPB, Q.p.I.18). *Text in Transcription* (Polata knigopisnaja, 19-20), Nijmegen, 1988, pp. 1-196; for the collection on ff. 131r-140r see pp. 131-141.

³¹ The collection of 77 has only been edited on the basis of a late manuscript of 1655 which has interpolations from elsewhere giving a total of 92 QQ, see I. ФРАНКО, *Апокрифи і легенди з українських рукописів* (Пам'ятки української мови і літератури, 1-4, 6), 5 vols, Львів, 1896-1910, iv, pp. 428-448; the collection of 70 has been edited by В. ИСТРИН, *Замечания о составе Толковой Палеи*, in *Сборник Отделения русского языка и словесности Императорской Академии наук*, 65, 6 (1898), pp. 83-95, but includes five questions not by Theodoret; on the collection see below notes 153-154.

³² For a brief survey of some of the collections see Т. СЛАВОВА, *Славянският превод на коментарите на Теодорит Кирски върху Петокнижието*, in *Старобългаристика*, 24, 4 (2000), pp. 7-18.

³³ The *Nomocanon XIV titulorum*, ed. В. БЕНЕШЕВИЧ, *Древне-славянская кормчая XIV титулов без толкований*, 2 vols, Санктпетербург, 1906 - София 1987, i, pp. 1-837, for the *Responsa* see pp. 541-546. The theory that the translation was made in Russia in the eleventh century is contradicted by the linguistic evidence, which need not be examined here.

³⁴ A. DE SANTOS OTERO, *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der altslavischen Apokryphen*, 2 vols (*Patristische Texte und Studien*, 20, 23), Berlin, 1978-1981, i, pp. 197-209, and ii, pp. 253-254, lists 62 manuscripts, but fails to differentiate between four different works, see F. THOMSON, *Apocrypha Slavica: I-II*, in *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 58 (1980), p. 267. There are at least eleven editions of the first apocalypse and five of the third, most of which are listed by de Santos Otero.

it is quoted in the “Trinity Chronograph”, a Russian chronicle probably of the fourteenth century.³⁵

During the period of the Second Bulgarian Empire and the Serbian Empire the number of translations increased rapidly and erotapocritic works include a second version of Gregory the Great’s *Dialogi*, the earliest manuscripts of which date from the fourteenth century, e.g. *codex Vindobonensis slavicus* 22.³⁶ The ascetic works of Basil of Caesarea are among the most influential works ever written on the monastic life and the core of his *Ascetica* is formed by the two collections of his erotapocritic rules, the *Regulae fusius tractatae per interrogationes et responsiones* and the *Regulae brevius tractatae* (CPG 2875). The *recensio vulgata* of the rules, consisting of 55 longer rules and 313 shorter ones (about one third of which in fact deal with ἀπορίαι), had in fact been translated in the tenth century but only a fragment of two folia has survived containing the end of *regula xxxiv fusius tractata* and the beginning of *regula xxxv*.³⁷ A second translation of

³⁵ On Synodal *codex* 881, now in the State History Museum, Moscow, see A. ГОРСКИЙ - К. НЕВОСТРУЕВ, *Описание славянских рукописей Московской Синодальной библиотеки* (three parts in six vols), Москва, 1855-1917, ii, 3, pp. 590-593; only the passage in the chronicle has been published on the basis of the fifteenth-century *codex* 728 in the collection of the Trinity Laura of St Sergius, see M. TAUBE, *Une source inconnue de la chronographie russe: le Dialogue de Timothée et Aquila*, in *Revue des études slaves*, 58 (1991), pp. 117-120. The dating of the chronicle is controversial but the question cannot be examined here.

³⁶ On the manuscript see ЯЦИМИРСКИЙ, *Описание* [see note 23], i, pp. 131-139, and G. BIRKFELLNER, *Glagolitische und kyrillische Handschriften in Österreich (Schriften der Balkankommission. Linguistische Abteilung, 23)*, Vienna, 1975, pp. 119-120. Only minor excerpts have been published, most recently in parallel with the same passages in the first translation by М. ТИХОВА and Е. ИВАНОВА, *Римският патерик като извор за историята на медицинските знания*, in Е. МАЙЕР - Е. WEIHER (ed.), *Abhandlungen zu den Großen Lesemenäen des Metropoliten Makarij. Kodikologische, miszellenologische und textologische Untersuchungen (Monumenta linguae slavicae dialecti veteris. Fontes et dissertationes, 49)*, Freiburg im Br., 2006, pp. 233-244.

³⁷ The fragment has been edited by P. LAVROV and A. VAILLANT, *Les Règles de saint Basile en vieux slave: les Feuilletts du Zographou*, in *Revue des études slaves*, 10 (1930), pp. 8-11, together with the same passage in the second translation based on a Bulgarian manuscript of 1444, *codex* 8 suppl. in the collection of Aleksey Khludov, now in the State History Museum, Moscow, *ibidem*, pp. 12-14. The tenth-century fragment is preserved in the library of Zographou on Athos, see Б. РАЙКОВ - С. КОЖУХАРОВ - Х. МИКЛАС - Х. КОДОВ, *Каталог на славянските ръкописи в библиотеката на Зографския манастир в Света Гора (Balcanica II. Inventaires et catalogues)*, София, 1994, p. 141, № 281. On the Khludov manuscript see А. ПОПОВ, *Первое прибавление к Описанию рукописей и каталогу книг церковной печати библиотеки А. И. Хлудова*, Москва, 1875, p. 7; P. FEDWICK, *The Translations of the Works of Basil of Caesarea*, in ИДЕМ (ed.), *Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic. A Sixteen-Hundredth Symposium*, Toronto, 1981, p. 507, incorrectly states that it is a Serbian manuscript. Both the Zographou fragment and the Khludov manuscript are listed by P. FEDWICK, *Bibliotheca Basiliana universalis. A Study of the Manuscript Tradition, Translations and Editions of the Works of Basil of Caesarea (Corpus Christianorum)*, 5 vols, Turnhout, 1993-2004, iii, pp. 241-243 and 277.

the *Ascetica* was made in the fourteenth century, this time of the Studite recension in which the *Regulae* are not divided into two series but form one collection of 355 rules, the earliest manuscripts being of the fourteenth century, e.g. Bulgarian *codex* 129 in the collection of the Trinity Laura of St Sergius.³⁸ The *Ascetica* were included in the menologium compiled between c. 1530 and 1554 for Macarius, archbishop of Novgorod (1526-1542) and then metropolitan of Moscow (1542-1563), under the date of 1 January, Basil's feast day, while the *editio princeps* of them appeared at Ostrog in the Ukraine in 1594.³⁹

Several of Maximus Confessor's theological and spiritual works are written in the form of ἐρωταποκρίσεις, one of which, the *Compendiaria fidei expositio* (CPG 7707, § 28), was translated in the fourteenth century, from which century the earliest manuscripts date, e.g. a Serbian florilegium now *codex* 83 in the collection of the monastery of the Ascension at Peć.⁴⁰ It became very popular and was included in the Macarian menologium under the date of 31 August.⁴¹ It was first published in a collection of theological works known as the *Kirillova kniga*, "Cyril's Book", at Moscow in 1644 and frequently ever since as it was prefaced to Moscow editions of the psalter combined with a short horologium.⁴² Maximus' erotapocritic *Liber asceticus per interrogationem et responsionem* (CPG 7692) was translated

³⁸ For a description of the manuscript, in which the *Regulae* are on ff. 67r-150r, see ИЛАРИЙ - АРСЕНИЙ, *Описание славянских рукописей библиотеки Свято-Троицкой Сергиевой лавры*, vol. i, in *Чтения в Императорском Обществе истории и древностей российских*, 1878/2 [105], pp. 95-96; it is listed by FEDWICK, *Bibliotheca*, iii [see note 37], p. 280.

³⁹ For the Macarian menologium see Иосиф, *Подробное оглавление Великих Четвух Миней Всероссийского Митрополита Макария, хранящихся в Московской Патриаршей (ныне Синодальной) Библиотеке*, 2 vols, Москва, 1892, i, cols 321-374; the volume containing the days of January 1-6 was published in 1910 without the *Ascetica* and the planned separate edition never appeared. On the Ostrog edition of 1594, in which the *Regulae* are on ff. 16v-292v, see В. ФРИС, *Книга о постничестве Василя Великого (Остриг, 1594) у збірках м. Львова, Матеріали I-III Науково-краєзнавчих конференцій "Остриг на порозі 900-річчя"* (1990-1992), vol. 2, Остриг, 1992, pp. 70-73, and М. БОЙКО, *Острозька та Дерманська друкарни (Праці Осередка бібліографії Волині*, 16), Блумингтон, 1980, pp. 93-94; on some of the many excerpts taken from the *Regulae* see below.

⁴⁰ On the manuscript see В. МОШИН, *Рукописи Пейке Патриаршије*, in *Старине Косова и Метохије*, 4-5 (1968-71), pp. 110-113.

⁴¹ See Иосиф, *Оглавление*, [see note 39], ii, col. 463. The August volume of the menologium has not yet been published.

⁴² *Kirillova kniga*, ff. 550v-552r; for a recent edition of it in a Slavonic Psalter see that published at Jordanville in 1959, ff. 4r-5r. The 1644 collection was called "Cyril's Book" because the first entry on ff. 1r-82r is a Slavonic translation of Cyril of Jerusalem's *Catechesis XV, De Antichristo* (CPG 3585, § 15), intermingled with a commentary by Stephen Zizany († after 1599) intended to 'prove' that the Pope is the Antichrist so that the reader gains the impression that Cyril considered the Pope to be the Antichrist.

in 1425 by James, a Serbian monk on Athos, and the earliest manuscript is an East Slav florilegium of 1432, now *codex* 175 in the collection of the Trinity Laura of St Sergius.⁴³ There is, however, evidence that at least some of the ἑρωταποκρίσεις had been translated by the eleventh century since the Macarian menologium under the date of 29 February has a large collection of patristic excerpts which includes some QQ from the *Liber asceticus* as well as some from Maximus' *Capita de caritate* (CPG 7693). Two excerpts of the latter, viz. cc. 58 and 60 of the first century, are found in the same translation in the above mentioned florilegium of 1076 on f. 28 r-v, so there is reason to believe that at least some of the QQ of the *Liber asceticus* were also available then.⁴⁴ Incidentally, the collection of patristic excerpts in the Macarian menologium includes an excerpt taken from the erotapocritic *Acta in primo exilio, seu Dialogus cum Theodosio episcopo Caesareae in Bithynia* (BHG 1233; CPG 7735) by Maximus' disciple Anastasius the apocrisiary.⁴⁵

The nomocanon translated for Archbishop Sabas of Serbia in c. 1219 contains three erotapocritic works of canon law: the *Responsa canonica* of Nicetas of Heracleia, the *Decreta synodalia* of Patriarch Nicholas III Grammaticus of Constantinople and the third translation of Timothy of Alexandria's *Responsa canonica*, this time of the abridged form with the commentary by Alexius Aristenus.⁴⁶ The earliest copy of the nomocanon was copied at the behest of Bishop Neophytus of Zeta (1262-1269) for the church of

⁴³ It has not been published; for a description of the manuscript of 1432 see ИЛАРИЙ-АРСЕНИЙ, *Описание* [see note 38], pp. 157-158. On James see К. ТРИФУНОВИЋ, *Стара српска књижевност. Основе* (Библиотека Албатрос, 47), Београд, 1994, pp. 242-245, whose claim that he was a monk of St Paul's monastery on Athos requires substantiation.

⁴⁴ For a juxtaposition of the texts in the 1076 manuscript and the menologium see Д. БУЛАНИН, *Античные традиции в древнерусской литературе XI-XVI вв.* (Slavistische Beiträge, 278), München, 1991, p. 129. This evidence is not, however, enough to substantiate Bulanin's claim, ИДЕМ, *Неизвестный источник Изборника 1076 года*, in *Труды Отдела древнерусской литературы*, 44 (1990), p. 169, that there had been an early, complete translation of the *Liber asceticus*, which had been "completely supplanted" (совершенно вытеснен) by the 1425 translation.

⁴⁵ See БУЛАНИН, *Традиции* [see note 44], p. 125.

⁴⁶ The manuscript is now *codex* III.c.9 in the collection of the Croatian Academy, Zagreb, edited in facsimile by М. ПЕТРОВИЋ, *Законоправило или Номоканон Светога Саве: Иловицки препис 1262. година*, Горњи Милановац, 1991, ff. 1r-400v, see 199v-200r (Timothy); 340v-344r (Nicholas); 344r-346v (Nicetas); all three translations are found in printed editions of the nomocanon, the *editio princeps* of which appeared at Moscow in 1650, see ff. 269v-270v, 577r-582v and 583r-586v respectively. The 1650 edition was last reprinted at Moscow in 1914. Contrary to what is often asserted, Sabas did not himself compile the nomocanon as its contents are very similar to those of *codex Vaticanus graecus* 1127 of the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century, on which *codex* see L. BURGMANN, *Der Codex Vaticanus graecus 1167 und der serbische Nomokanon*, in *Зборник радова Византолошког института*, 34 (1995), pp. 94-99.

Archangel Michael at Ilovica in 1262 and some of the later copies, e.g. the copy made for Bishop Gregory of Ras († c. 1313) in 1305, also contain Pseudo-Cyril of Alexandria's *Dialogus cum Nestorio* (CPG 5433).⁴⁷ A fourth translation of Timothy's *Responsa* in an abridged form without a commentary but with three more questions appended to the fifteen genuine ones is found in a fourteenth-century Bulgarian nomocanon.⁴⁸ Two erotapocritic works of canon law deserve in this context a special mention. The first work consists of the *Responsa canonica* of metropolitan John II of Kiev (1076/7-1089/90), a Greek, to questions put to him by a certain monk called James. The Slavonic version contains 34 QQ, whereas the Greek text only has 20 QQ, viz. 1-16, 18-20 and 33. Whether the Greek textual tradition is defective or whether more QQ were subsequently added to the original collection is uncertain. They are mostly of a practical nature, the baptism of sickly children, association with Catholics, the dress of clergy and their participation in popular revelling, etc.⁴⁹ The second of the two works involved the intervention of the patriarchal synod at Constantinople: in 1261 a bishopric was established at the capital of the Golden Horde at Saray on the Volga and in 1276 at the time of Khan Möngkä Temür (1267-1280) Theognostus, the second occupant of the see (1269-1291/6), went to Constantinople to put fifteen questions mainly on liturgical points to the synod presided over by Patriarch John XI Beccus (1275-1282). The *Decreta synodalia* (RAPC 4, № 1427) were translated into Slavonic and in the

⁴⁷ The manuscript is now in two parts, ff. 1-398 form *codex* 29 in the collection of the New Jerusalem monastery of the Resurrection, now in the State History Museum, Moscow, while ff. 399-424 form *codex* 25 in the collection of Vukol Undol'sky, now in the State Library of Russia, Moscow. The text of the *Dialogus*, which is partly in both as it is on ff. 398r-400r, has not as yet been published; for a bibliography and a list of some manuscripts see С. ТРОИЦКИ, *Како треба издати Светосавску крмчију (Номоканон са тумачењима)* (Споменик Српске академије наука, 102), Belgrade, 1952, p. 92.

⁴⁸ The manuscript is now *codex* 1160 in the Ecclesiastical Museum of History and Archaeology, Sofia, and has been published in facsimile by А. КРЪСТЕВ and Ц. ЯНАКИЕВА, *Архивски номоканон. Български ръкопис от XIV век*, Шумен, 2007, ff. 1r-205v, for the *Responsa* see ff. 122v-125v.

⁴⁹ The best edition is that by В. БЕНЕШЕВИЧ, *Сборник памятников по истории церковного права, преимущественно русского, кончая временем Петра Великого*, 2 vols (*Хрестоматии памятников по истории, литературе и праву*, 1), Петроград, 1914 [The date on the cover is 1915], i, pp. 108-120, who took the Slavonic text from the edition by А. ПАВЛОВ, *Памятники древне-русского канонического права*, 2 vols, ред. В. БЕНЕШЕВИЧ (*Русская историческая библиотека*, 6, 36), Санкт-Петербург, 1908-1920, i, cols 1-20, but published a better Greek text. The frequently repeated theory that metropolitan John was the uncle of the poet Theodore Prodromos (c. 1100-c. 1170) is chronologically speaking improbable, while the theory that the monk James is to be identified as the monk whom St Theodosius on his deathbed in 1074 proposed as his successor as abbot of the Dormition monastery of the Caves at Kiev is possible but unprovable. Neither theory need be examined here.

course of time new ἐρωταποκρίσεις on points of canon law were added to them in Muscovy so that the fifteen decisions are never found on their own. The largest such collection consists of thirty-three QQ, of which QQ 1-7, 9, 28-33 correspond to Greek QQ 1-14.⁵⁰ The final question on the jurisdiction of the see of Saray is not found in any of the collections probably because the synodal decision led to a dispute between the sees of Saray and Ryazan over the boundaries of their respective jurisdictions.⁵¹ Both John's *Responsa canonica* and various collections of the *Decreta synodalia* are found in some nomocanons but were never added to the official nomocanon.

More spiritual in nature are the *Quaestiones et responsiones* of Barsanuphius and John of Gaza (CPG 7350) but how many of their replies to the 848 questions put to them were translated is uncertain as the various collections have not been studied. One of the earlier manuscripts, *codex* 190 in the collection of the Trinity Laura of St Sergius copied in 1418, on ff. 251r-271r contains a collection of 38 QQ beginning with Q 10,⁵² but sixteenth-century *codex* 130/476 in the collection of the Dormition Monastery at Volokolamsk clearly has a larger collection on ff. 280r-331v.⁵³ As in the case of other erotapocritic collections the number of QQ in the manuscripts varies and can be as little as one or two.⁵⁴ In Greek – and hence also in Slavonic – a short series of five ἐρωταποκρίσεις on spiritual matters by the Byzantine theologian Nicetas Stethatus (fl. eleventh century) are found prefaced to his *Practicorum, physicorum et gnosticorum capitum centuriae tres*, which were translated in the fourteenth century.⁵⁵ The *Adversus Iudaeos disputationes*, an erotapocritic anti-Jewish polemic, was translated

⁵⁰ The collection of 33 QQ ed. ПАВЛОВ, *Памятники* [see note 49], i, cols 129-140; there are several editions of the Greek original including *ibidem*, appendix, pp. 5-12.

⁵¹ The documents relating to the dispute are edited *ibidem*, i, cols 163-171.

⁵² On the *codex*, now in the State Library of Russia, Moscow, see ИЛАРИЙ - АРСЕНИЙ, *Описание* [see note 38], i, p. 187.

⁵³ On the manuscript, now in the State Library of Russia, Moscow, see ИОСИФ, *Опись рукописей перенесенных из библиотеки Иосифова монастыря в библиотеку Московской Духовной Академии*, in *Чтения в Императорском Обществе истории и древностей российских*, 1881/3 [118], p. 90, who does not, however, specify the precise number of QQ.

⁵⁴ E.g. in another manuscript in the Volokolamsk collection, *codex* 152/515, there are only two on ff. 218r-220r, see *ibidem*, p. 151.

⁵⁵ The earliest manuscripts are of the fourteenth century, e.g. *codex Hilandaricus* 399 on ff. 128r-129r, where it is followed by the centuries on ff. 129r-161v, see Д. БОГДАНОВИЧ, *Каталог хирлиских рукописи манастира Хиландара*, Београд, 1978, p. 156. Neither the questions nor the centuries have been published; for the Greek original of the questions see I. HAUSHERR - G. HORN, *Un grand mystique byzantin. Vie de Syméon le Nouveau Théologien (949-1022) par Nicéas Stéthatos*, in *Orientalia Christiana* 12, 45 (1928), pp. XXXIV-XXXV.

at this time and is found in a Serbian florilegium of the late fourteenth century.⁵⁶ However, the Slavonic version differs greatly from the published Greek one: whereas the latter consists of five disputations ascribed to a certain abbot Anastasius,⁵⁷ the Slavonic version consists of three anonymous disputations, the first of which corresponds to the first Greek one,⁵⁸ but the second is *Papisci et Philonis Judaeorum cum monacho colloquium* (CPG 7796) in a redaction differing from the published Greek one,⁵⁹ while the third disputation has not as yet been traced in Greek. For obvious reasons Byzantine anti-Latin polemics increased after the events of 1204 and several were translated in the fourteenth century, including the pseudonymous erotapocritic *Constantini panagiotae cum azymita disputatio*, the earliest dated manuscript of which is a Serb codex of 1384.⁶⁰ There is a second Slavonic version of the fifteenth century but for lack of a critical examination it remains uncertain whether it is the translation of a variant Greek redaction or whether both Slavonic versions are varying revisions of one untraced earlier translation.⁶¹ More erotapocritic apocryphal works were

⁵⁶ It is *codex* 83 in the collection of the monastery of the Ascension at Peć, which is the same manuscript which contains Maximus Confessor's *Compendiaria fidei expositio*, see above note 40. For an edition of the anti-Jewish disputations based on fifteenth-century East Slav *codex* XII in the collection of the Dormition Monastery of St Cyril of Belozero see Г. ПРОХОРОВ (ред.), *Энциклопедия русского игумена XIV-XV вв. Сборник преподобного Кирилла Белозерского. Российская Национальная Библиотека, Кирилло-Белозерское собрание № XII* (Древнерусские сказания о достопамятных людях, местах и событиях, 8), Санкт-Петербург, 2003, pp 129-139.

⁵⁷ Ed. PG 89, cols 1204-1281. Who abbot Anastasius was is uncertain. Σ. ΣΑΚΚΟΣ, *Περὶ Ἀναστασίων Συναϊτῶν* (Επιστημονικὴ Ἑπερηρὶς τῆς Θεολογικῆς Σχολῆς τοῦ Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης. Παράρτημα τοῦ η' τόμου), Θεσσαλονίκη, 1964, pp. 194-199, would identify him as presbyter Anastasius ὁ ἀλληγοριστής; on the various Anastasii see below note 68.

⁵⁸ Viz. PG 89, cols 1204-1225.

⁵⁹ Ed. A. MCGIFFERT, *Dialogue between a Christian and a Jew entitled ANTIBOAN ΠΑΠΙΣΚΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΦΙΛΩΝΟΣ ΙΟΥΔΑΙΩΝ ΠΡΟΣ ΜΟΝΑΧΟΝ ΤΙΝΑ. The Greek Text Edited with Introduction and Notes, Together with a Discussion of Christian Polemics against the Jews*, New York, 1889, pp. 51-83.

⁶⁰ Edited by А. ПОПОВ, *Историко-литературный обзор древне-русских сочинений против латинян. (XI-XV в.)*, Москва, 1875, pp. 251-254, on the basis of a manuscript which belonged to him, the present location of which is unknown. It is also found in another fourteenth-century Serb manuscript, *codex* 189 in the collection of Aleksey Khudov, now in the State History Museum, Moscow, see А. Попов, *Описание рукописей и каталог книг церковной печати библиотеки А. И. Худова*, Москва, 1872, p. 380.

⁶¹ Edited by ПОПОВ, *Обзор* [see note 60], pp. 265-281, once again on the basis of a manuscript in his possession, the present location of which is unknown. This version was included under the date of 30 June in the Macarian menologium, see ИОСИФ, *Оглавление* [see note 39] ii, col. 292. The June volume of the menologium has not yet been published. There are at least three Greek redactions, a short one, ed. A. VASSILIEV, *Anecdota graeco-byzantina*, vol. i (Ученые записки Императорского Московского университета по историко-филологическому отделу, 11), Moscow, 1893, pp. 179-188; a longer one, ed.

translated such as the *Didascalia Jesu Christi, apostolis interrogantibus* (BHG 812a-e), the earliest manuscript of which is a thirteenth-century Serbian florilegium.⁶²

By the time Zoe (1450/1-1503), daughter of Thomas (1409-1465), brother of the last emperor, Constantine XI (1449-1453),⁶³ arrived in Muscovy in 1472 to marry Grand Prince Ivan III (1462-1505) the country was already looking westwards rather than southwards, which is reflected in the translations of erotapocritic works. Thus when Demetrius Tarchaniotes, who had arrived at Moscow in Zoe's suite, translated Athanasius of Alexandria's *Disputatio habita in concilio Nicaeno contra Arium* (CPG 2250) he did so from Latin and not Greek,⁶⁴ while in 1500 Demetrius Gerasimov (c. 1455-after 1536) translated Nicholas of Lyra's *Quaestiones disputatae contra Hebraeos* (F. STEGMÜLLER, *Repertorium biblicum medii aevi* [11 vols, Madrid, 1950-1980] 4, 5981-5982) for Archbishop Gennadius of Novgorod (1484-1504, † 1505), a work which belongs to the scholastic genre of *quaestiones de quolibet* and is entirely unrelated to Byzantine ἐρωταποκρίσεις.⁶⁵ The

Н. КРАСНОСЕЛЬЦЕВ, *Addenda к изданию А. Васильева 'Anecdota graeco-byzantina' (Москва 1893)*, in *Летопись Историко-филологического общества при Императорском Новороссийском университете*, 7 (1899), pp. 174-181, and an interpolated one, ed. ИДЕМ, 'Прение Панагиота с Азимитом' по новым греческим спискам, in *Летопись Историко-филологического общества при Императорском Новороссийском университете*, 6 (1896), pp. 311-328. The list of 'Latin errors' contained in the longer version was published in "Cyril's Book" at Moscow in 1644, ff. 233r-241v; on this book see above note 42.

⁶² It is on ff. 186r-192v of *codex* 651 in the collection of the Serbian National Library, Belgrade. There are several editions including one on the basis of this manuscript by М. СОКОЛОВ, *Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе*, 4, *Откровение святым апостолам*, in *Известия Историко-филологического Института Князя Безбородко в Нежине*, 11, 1887-1889, pp. 68-72.

⁶³ He is sometimes called Constantine XII but Constantine Lascaris was not crowned at Constantinople in early April 1204 just prior to the storming of the city by the Crusaders on 12 April.

⁶⁴ In the sixteenth century the translation was included in the Macarian menologium for the feast of St Athanasius on 18 January, see ИОСИФ, *Оглавление* [see note 39], i, col. 404. The menologium texts of January 12-31 have not yet been published. For a brief survey of the Slavonic translations available in Muscovy see F. THOMSON, *The Corpus of Slavonic Translations Available in Muscovy. The Cause of Old Russia's Intellectual Silence and a Contributory Factor to Muscovite Cultural Autarky*, in B. GASPAROV - O. RAYEVSKY-HUGHES (ed.), *Christianity and the Eastern Slavs*, vol. i (*California Slavic Studies*, 16), Berkeley, 1993, pp. 179-214; on the translation of the *Disputatio* see p. 186.

⁶⁵ The translation has been edited by Е. ФЕДОРОВА, *Трактат Николая де Лиры "Probatio adventus Christi" и его церковнославянский перевод конца века*, 2 vols, Москва, 1999 [*non vidi*]. Nicholas' work, which is also known by several other names, e.g. *Probatio adventus Christi* and *Disputatio contra perfidiam Judaeorum*, exists in two versions: the original version of the debate in 1309 and a revised version of 1331/4. Incidentally, Archbishop Gennadius was the sponsor of the first complete Slavonic Bible finished in 1499

period of the assimilation of Byzantine culture had come to an end and Muscovy's gradual emergence from the Middle Ages had begun.

Of the many Greek erotapocritic works translated into Slavonic during the period of the first Bulgarian empire the most important was Anastasius Sinaita's *Interrogationes et responsiones* (CPG 7746), the translation of which is linked with the name of Khan Boris' son Symeon (c. 864-927), who came to the throne in 893 and assumed the title of tsar in 913. Born in c. 864 Symeon was sent by his father to Constantinople in c. 878 to be educated. There he remained for some eight years and even the Greeks admitted that he had enjoyed an excellent education. Liutprand of Cremona (c. 920-970/2), who went on his first mission to Constantinople in 949 only twenty-four years after Symeon's death, reports that the Greeks had told him: "*Hunc etenim Simeonem emiargon – id est semigrecum – esse aiebant, eo quod a puericia Bizantii Demosthenis rhetoricam Aristotelisque silogismos dedicerit*".⁶⁶

Symeon himself was responsible for the choice of several Greek works to be translated and in one case he personally selected no fewer than 136 passages from the sermons of John Chrysostom – mostly the endings with the moral to be learned from the preceding exegesis of a particular Biblical passage – to form a collection called the *Zlatostrui*, "Golden Streams".⁶⁷

and among the Latin works which the compilers consulted was Nicholas' *Postilla litteralis et moralis in Vetus et Novum Testamentum* (STEGMÜLLER, *Repertorium* 4, 5829-5974).

⁶⁶ Antapodosis, III, 29, ed. P. CHIESA, *Liutprandi Cremonensis Antapodosis, Homilia paschalis, Historia Ottonis, Relatio de legatione Constantinopolitana* (*Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio mediaevalis*, 156), Turnhout, 1998, pp. 3-150, see p. 81.

⁶⁷ The preface to the collection begins: "Having studied all the old and new books of Holy Scripture, internal and external,⁽¹⁾ and having examined the ways and customs and wisdom of all the teachers, having marvelled at the spiritual wisdom of, and the grace of the Holy Spirit on, this blessed John Chrysostom, the pious Tsar Symeon acquired the habit of reading all his books and, having selected all the passages from all of his books, he collected them into this one book, which he called the Golden Streams. For if another (person) has been called by this name the Golden Stream,⁽²⁾ then we have not, I think, in any way erred by having named this book the Golden Streams in as much as the teachings of the Holy Spirit by sweet words as if by golden streams washing men by saving repentance from all sin, lead to God".

(1) Viz. Christian and non-Christian (Jewish), cf. I Cor. 5:12, where Paul differentiates between οἱ ἔξω and οἱ ἔσω, those outside and those inside the Church.

(2) The epithet χρυσορροῶς, *streaming with gold*, was in fact applied to both John Chrysostom and John of Damascus, see LAMPE, *Lexicon*, p. 1535, but Symeon clearly had John Chrysostom in mind. The best edition of the preface is that by В. МАЛИНИН, *Исследование «Златоструя» по рукописи XII века Императорской Публичной библиотеки, Киев, 1878*, pp. 30-31. For the Greek sources of the passages chosen by Symeon see F. THOMSON, *Chrysostomica Palaeoslavica. A Preliminary Study of the Sources of the Chrysorrhoeas (Zlatostruy) Collection*, in *Cyrrillomethodianum*, 6 (1982), pp. 1-65, and Я. МИЛТЕНОВ, *Златоструй: старобългарски хомилетичен свод, създаден по инициатива на българския цар Симеон. Текстологическо и извороведско изследване*, София, 2013,

However, the most important translation with which Symeon's name is closely associated is Anastasius Sinaita's *Interrogationes et responsiones*.

Several collections of ἐρωταποκρίσεις are ascribed to Anastasius († shortly after 700) and the genuine one contains about 103 QQ, although the number varies so much in the manuscripts that the precise number is uncertain, which is hardly surprising as the order of the questions is so unsystematic that it has rightly been called "haphazard".⁶⁸ The commonest collection, as yet unpublished, is a Pseudo-Anastasian collection of 88 ἐρωταποκρίσεις, only 32 of which are the same as or related to questions in the genuine collection and even their texts are in a variant form, to which Biblical and patristic passages in support of the replies have been appended so that it somewhat resembles a catena. The compiler clearly chose the passages carefully and not with the intention merely of displaying his erudition and he also ordered the QQ fairly systematically.⁶⁹ The collection is

pp. 37-120. The sole edition is of a shorter version with 81 entries in the Macarian Menologium for the feast of St John Chrysostom, November 13, ed. *Великие Минеи Четии собранные всероссийским митрополитом Макарием. Ноябрь дни 13-15*, Санктпетербург, 1899, cols. 1184-1579.

⁶⁸ See J. MUNITIZ, *Introduction*, in M. RICHARD - J. MUNITIZ (ed.), *Anastasii Sinaitae Quaestiones et responsiones* (CCSG, 59), Turnhout, 2006, p. L, who considers, *ibidem*, p. LVI, that another 18 QQ are probably genuine, another five perhaps genuine and includes another five "as isolated examples of the sort of questions frequently attributed to Anastasius, though unlikely to be authentic"; for the 103 genuine QQ see RICHARD - MUNITIZ, *Anastasii*, pp. 4-165; the probably genuine QQ in appendices 1-18, *ibidem*, pp. 171-204; the possibly genuine QQ in appendices 19-23a, *ibidem*, pp. 204-217, and the probably inauthentic QQ in appendices 23b-27, *ibidem*, pp. 217-232. The QQ in the appendices as quoted here by their number prefaced by app. The attempt to attribute the ἐρωταποκρίσεις to three people, the hermeneutic QQ to Patriarch Anastasius II of Antioch (599-609/10), who may have been a monk on Sinai, the ethical QQ to Anastasius of Nicaea and the physiological QQ to presbyter Anastasius ὁ ἀλληγοριστής, see ΣΑΚΚΟΣ, *Ἀναστασίον* [see note 57], pp. 150-152, has rightly been rejected, see, for example, G. WEISS, Review of ΣΑΚΚΟΣ, *Περὶ Ἀναστασίων Συναιτῶν*, in *BZ*, 60 (1967), pp. 342-346, especially p. 345. Later statements to the effect that the author was Anastasius II of Antioch, e.g. КУЕВ, *Иван* [see note 21], p. 295, and Б. ХРИСТОВА, *Тълкуванията на старозаветни и новозаветни книги в средновековната българска култура*, in *Старобългаристика*, 18, 2 (1994), p. 76, reflect a lack of acquaintance with all the relevant literature.

⁶⁹ A critical edition is being prepared by Professor Marc De Groote of the University of Ghent for publication in *Corpus Christianorum*. A Latin translation of the collection by the French theologian and humanist Gentien Hervet (1499-1584) was published over four hundred years ago in the collection of patristic works edited by the French patrologist Marguerin de La Bigne (c. 1546-c. 1597), which first appeared at Paris in 1576, see M. DE LA BIGNE, *Sacra Bibliotheca Sanctorum Patrum supra ducentos, qua continentur illorum de rebus divinis opera omnia et fragmenta* [...], 8 vols, Paris, 1575¹, vi, pp. 121-237. The questions are ascribed to *Anastasius Episcopus Nicenus* and are followed by a translation of four appendices to the collection numbered as Q 92, *ibidem*, vi, pp. 237-240. These are found in the Slavonic translation as the tenth to thirteenth appendices, see below. The codex which Hervet used as the basis for his translation did not contain all of the patristic passages appended to the Pseudo-Anastasian answers and so he included those which he had found elsewhere,

conventionally called Pseudo-Anastasian, although the term is not entirely appropriate since it is virtually contemporary with the genuine collection and the relation between the two is problematic.⁷⁰ A third collection, also Pseudo-Anastasian, with 154 questions was first published by Jakob Gretser (1562-1625) at Ingolstadt in 1617.⁷¹

In the translation associated with Symeon the collection of 88 ἐρωταποκρίσεις forms the core of a Greek florilegium, twenty-one Greek manuscripts of which have been traced, the earliest of them being *codex Parisinus Coislinianus* 120 and *codex Patmius* 109, both of the early tenth

ibidem, vi, pp. 240-274. The ascription to Anastasius of Nicaea, on whom see H.-G. BECK, *Kirche und Theologie im byzantinischen Reich (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft*, 12, 2, 1), Munich, 1959, p. 419, is found in some manuscripts, e.g. *codex Parisinus graecus* 1259 A of the fourteenth century, on the codex see М. БИБИКОВ, *Византийский прототип древнейшей славянской книги (Изборник Святослава 1073 г.)*, Москва, 1996, pp. 85-88. The numbering of the questions in Hervet's Latin translation is highly defective, viz. 1-9, 9-26, 23, 28-32, 32, 34-62, two unnumbered, 65, 65-79, 79-90, one unnumbered. On the basis of the numbering in Migne's *Patrologia graeca* it contains, in this order, QQ 1-19, 21-22, 23a+c+24a, —, 20, 23b+24b, 25-31, 33, 35-41, 42a-g, 43-59, 142-151, 60-64, 65a-b, 66-70, 128, 71-74, 152-154.

⁷⁰ See MUNITIZ, *Introduction*, p. LII [see note 68].

⁷¹ Ed. J. GRETSEK, *Sancti Anastasii Sinaitae, Patriarchae Antiocheni Quaestiones et Responsiones de varijs argumentis CLIV nunc primum graece et latine cum insigni auctario publicatae*, Ingolstadt, 1617, pp. 1-685. Gretser had in fact added seven more *quaestiones vagantes*, viz. 98a-b, 100a-c, 105a and 109a, thus making 161 in all, but he nevertheless retained the numbering of 1 to 154. For the accompanying Latin translation Gretser translated the questions not found in Hervet's version and in places revised the latter's translation of the others. The edition was reprinted in the fourteenth volume of Gretser's collected works published at Regensburg between 1734 and 1741, see J. GRETSEK, *Opera omnia antehac ab ipsomet auctore accurate recognita* [...], 17 vols, Regensburg, 1734-1741, xiv (1740), pp. 166-446. Hervet's translation was reprinted in the second and third editions of DE LA BIGNE's *Bibliotheca* [see note 69], (Paris, 1589 – in which a half-hearted attempt was made to correct the numbering of the QQ – and 1610), but in the fourth edition (Cologne, 1618), Hervet's translation was replaced by Gretser's, which had appeared the previous year, ed. M. DE LA BIGNE, *Magna Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum et Antiquorum Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum* [...], 14 vols in 19, Cologne, 1618⁴, vi, 1, pp. 715-797. The final edition of de La Bigne's collection appeared at Lyons in 1677, for the translation see M. DE LA BIGNE, *Maxima Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum et Antiquorum Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum* [...], 27 vols, Lyons, 1677⁸, ix, pp. 987-1042. In 1860 Jacques-Paul Migne (1800-1875) reprinted the 1740 edition of Gretser's text so that Hervet's version still forms the basis of much of the Latin translation in PG 89, cols 312-824. The earliest manuscripts of the collection of 154 questions are of the eleventh century, e.g. *codex Laurentianus Pluteus* IV.16 copied in 1062, on which see БИБИКОВ, *Промомун* [see note 69], p. 119, and A. BANDINI, *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Mediceae Laurentianae varia continens opera Graecorum Patrum* [...], Florence, 1764, p. 540, whose date of 1063 is incorrect since the date in the colophon is October 6571, and *codex Laurentianus Pluteus* IV.35, on which see БИБИКОВ, *Промомун* [see note 69], pp. 115-117, and E. ROSTAGNO - N. FESTA, *Indice dei codici greci Laurenziani non compresi nel catalogo del Bandini*, in *Studi italiani di filologia classica*, 1 (1893), p. 218. There are other smaller Greek collections of Anastasian ἐρωταποκρίσεις but they need not be listed here; on the various collections with lists of the manuscripts see RICHARD - MUNITIZ, *Anastasii* [see note 68], pp. XIX-XXVIII.

century, so that the *terminus ante quem* for the compilation of the florilegium is c. 900.⁷² There is, however, some evidence that it may have been compiled between 877 and 886: in three manuscripts, viz. *Coislinianus* 120, *codex Ottobonianus graecus* 414 of the eleventh century and *codex Athous, Laura* Γ 115 of the thirteenth, three chronological lists have been appended to the concluding doxology of the florilegium. The first of the three is a list of popes and patriarchs in which the length of tenure of office is specified for each person. The list was clearly not compiled especially for the florilegium because the last pope is Honorius I (625-638), while the last patriarchs are Modestus of Jerusalem (c. 630-c. 634), Peter III of Alexandria (643/4-651) and Anastasius I of Antioch (559-570, 593-598/9). However, the list of patriarchs of Constantinople was continued in the *Laura* codex down to Photius' second period of office (877-886), without specifying the number of years as it does for all previous entries including Ignatius' second incumbency (867-877). In the other two codices it continues down to the second incumbency of Nicholas I Mysticus (912-925), although the last tenure of office for which the length is specified is that of Photius' first incumbency (858-867).⁷³ This evidence indicates that the original list, which went down to the early seventh century, was updated three times, first in 867/877 (*Coislin/Ottoboni*), then in 877/886 (*Laura*) and finally in 912/925 (*Coislin/Ottoboni*). It is possible that the first updating may have been done when the list was added to the florilegium, viz between 877 and 886.⁷⁴ Be that as it may, the *terminus post quem* for the compilation of the

⁷² For a description of the twenty-one manuscripts see БИБИКОВ, *Промомун* [see note 69], pp. 47-102; for the *Coislin* and *Patmos* codices see pp. 47-52 and 55-57 respectively; for a description of the many manuscripts which contain only parts of the florilegium see pp. 103-244. For *Parisinus Coislinianus* 120 see also de B. DE MONTFAUCON, *Bibliotheca Coisliniana olim Segueriana, sive Manuscriptorum omnium Graecorum, quae in ea continentur, accurata descriptio* [...], Paris, 1715, pp. 192-195, and R. DEVREESE, *Le fonds Coislin (Catalogue des manuscrits grecs. Bibliothèque Nationale. Département des manuscrits, 2)*, Paris, 1945, pp. 109-111; for *codex Patmius* 109 see Ί. ΣΑΚΚΕΛΙΩΝ, *Πατμιακή βιβλιοθήκη ἥτοι ἀναγραφὴ τῶν ἐν τῇ βιβλιοθήκῃ τῆς κατὰ τὴν νῆσον Πάτμον γεραρᾶς καὶ βασιλικῆς μονῆς τοῦ ἁγίου ἀποστόλου καὶ εὐαγγελιστοῦ Ἰωάννου τοῦ Θεολόγου τεθησαυρισμένων χειρογράφων τευχῶν*, Ἀθήνησιν, 1890, p. 65.

⁷³ See the lists ed. G. GROSCH, *De codice Coisliniano 120. Dissertatio chronologica*, Jena, 1886, pp. 1-8, who considers that in *Coislinianus* 120 the length of the second periods of office of both Ignatius and Photius were added by a later hand, see *ibidem*, p. 8, but Dr Douwe Sieswerda of the University of Amsterdam, who kindly checked the lists in the manuscripts, is not certain whether this was the case. For the *Ottoboni* codex see E. FERON - F. BATTAGLINI, *Codices manuscripti graeci Ottoboniani Bibliothecae Vaticanae descripti*, Rome, 1893, p. 225; for the *Laura* codex see SPYRIDON (KAMPANOS) - S. EUSTRATIADES, *Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts in the Library of the Laura on Mount Athos with Notices from Other Libraries (Harvard Theological Studies, 12)*, Cambridge (Mass.), 1925, pp. 48-49.

⁷⁴ For more details see F. THOMSON, *The Symeonian Florilegium: an Analysis of Its Relation to the Greek Textological Tradition and Its Association with Tsar Symeon, together with an Appendix on the Old Believers and the Codex of 1073*, in *Кирило-Методиевски студии*,

florilegium is 843, viz. the final restoration of iconodulia by Empress Theodora, regentess (842-856) for her two-year-old son Michael III (842-867), since it contains entries by two leading opponents of iconoclasm, namely Patriarch Nicephorus I of Constantinople (806-815, † 828), who was exiled when iconoclasm was restored by Emperor Leo V (813-824) in 815, and Michael Syncellus of Jerusalem (c. 760-846), who was twice incarcerated for his opposition to iconoclasm (814/5-820 and 834-842).

The florilegium is composed of three parts: the first contains ten entries summarizing the Christian faith, the second is the collection of 88 ἑρωταποκρίσεις, while the third consists of twenty-four entries arranged in fairly logical order which can be divided into six unequal groups: 1-9 contain definitions of basic Christian concepts and illustrations of the figurative as opposed to literal use of language in the Bible; 10-15 deal with the precise dates of Christ's earthly life and various divisions of the calendar; 16 is the Decalogue, the relevance of which for the Christian life is obvious although the reason for this precise place in the order of the entries is not; 17-19 deal with the canon of Scripture; 20-23 contain chronological lists of notable persons from Adam down to the Apostles; 24 is the concluding doxology. In two of the early manuscripts the florilegium has been given the title "Book of Salvation".⁷⁵

A. Prefaces

1. An excerpt from the fifth book of Basil of Caesarea's *Adversus Eunomium* (CPG 2837) on the necessity of belief in the triune God.⁷⁶

2. A series of twenty-six minor passages taken from Cyril of Alexandria's *Liber de sancta et consubstantiali Trinitate* (CPG 5216), five of which remain untraced, on the relations between the three persons of the Trinity.⁷⁷

18 (2009), pp. 248-308 [henceforth quoted as *Florilegium*], pp. 268-270. The claim that the *terminus ante quem* is c. 873 since the reply to Q 20 contains a passage on the cult of Apollonius of Tyana which is quoted by George Hamartolus in his *Chronicon breve*, thus J. VROOLAND - W. VEDER, *О рукописной традиции Симеонова сборника*, in *Polata knigopisnaja*, 35 (2006), p. 69, n. 2, is unsafe since the date when George completed his chronicle is disputed; for the details see THOMSON, *Florilegium*, p. 267.

⁷⁵ The title is found in the Coislin and Laura manuscripts: Βίβλος γενομένη καὶ συντεθεῖσα ἐκ διαφόρων λόγων καὶ διηγήσεων ψυχοφελῶν ἢ λεγομένη σωτήριος, see БИБИКОВ, *Протомун* [see note 69], pp. 48 and 78. On the meaning of the term σωτήριος in this context see D. SIESWERDA, *The Σωτήριος, the Original of the Izbornik of 1073*, in *Sacris erudiri*, 40 (2001), p. 296.

⁷⁶ Ed. PG 29, cols 497-773.

⁷⁷ Ed. PG 75, cols 861-864, 756-757, 789, 792, 967, 917-918, 820, cf. 948, 821, ?, 953, 1004, 960-961, 1008, 1008-1012, cf. 840, ?, ?, 908, 1013-1016, 1104-1105, 1105, ?, 1125-1128, 1128-1129, ?.

3. Isidore of Pelusium's *Epistola ccccxii, Heroni Scholastico* (CPG 5557), in which Isidore deals with Jesus' statement "my Father is greater than I" (John 14:28) by pointing out that like things can only be compared to like.⁷⁸

4. Twelve passages taken from Theodoret of Cyrrhus' *Expositio rectae fidei* (CPG 6218) dealing with the concepts of essence and substance and the two natures of Christ.⁷⁹

5. An excerpt of Maximus Confessor's *Quomodo inhabitaverit Deus Verbum* (CPG 7707, § 28) on the two natures of Christ.⁸⁰

6. Two of the surviving fragments of Anastasius of Antioch's *Ad Sergium grammaticum capita CL* (CPG 6957), again on Christ's two natures.⁸¹

7. An excerpt of Gregory of Nyssa's *Oratio catechetica magna* (CPG 3150), once more dealing with Christ's two natures.⁸²

8. A series of ten passages dealing with the incomprehensibility of God, who can only be apprehended by faith, nine of them taken from homilies 4, 5 and 7 of John Chrysostom's *In epistolam I ad Corinthios homiliae* (CPG 4428); the origin of the tenth passage remains untraced.⁸³ These are followed by a series of Biblical quotations, viz. Ecclesiasticus 1:3; Romans 11:33-34; 12:3; Ecclesiasticus 3:21-24; Ecclesiastes 8:17; 11:5; Wisdom 9:13-16; 13:6-7, 10.

9. Michael Syncellus' *Libellus de fide orthodoxa*.⁸⁴

⁷⁸ Ed. PG 78, col. 417.

⁷⁹ Ed. PG 6, cols 1208-1216, 1220, 1221-1224, 1224, 1225, 1225-1228, 1229-1232, 1232-1233, 1233-1236, 1237, 1237, 1240. The entry is incorrectly ascribed to "Justin the Philosopher", viz. Justin Martyr.

⁸⁰ Ed. С. ЕПИФАНОВИЧ, *Материалы к изучению жизни и творений преподобного Максима Исповедника*, Киев, 1917, pp. 82-83. The ascription is dubious as the passage has a Nestorian bias and reflects ideas expressed by Theodoret of Cyrrhus, a friend of Nestorius, in his *Expositio rectae fidei*, cf. PG 6, cols 1232-1237. The ideas also bear a certain resemblance to a passage in Theodore of Mopsuestia's *De incarnatione* (CPG 3856), ed. PG 66, cols 972-976.

⁸¹ Ed. G. WEISS, *Studia Anastasiana I. Studien zum Leben, zu den Schriften und zur Theologie des Patriarchen Anastasius I. von Antiochien (559-598)* (*Miscellanea Byzantina Monacensia*, 4), Munich, 1965, p. 128, and PG 89, cols 1285-1286, respectively; in the Slavonic translation this entry is anonymous.

⁸² Ed. PG 45, col. 41.

⁸³ Ed. PG 61, cols 31, 32, 56, cf. 32, 41, 42, 59, 60, 60-61, ?.

⁸⁴ Ed. DE MONTFAUCON, *Bibliotheca* [see note 72], pp. 90-93; for a collation of this edition with six other manuscripts see F. THOMSON, *Les cinq traductions slavonnes du Libellus de fide orthodoxa de Michel le Syncelle et les mythes de l'arianisme de saint Méthode, apôtre des Slaves, ou d'Hilarion, métropolitain de Russie, et de l'existence d'une Église arienne à Kiev*, in *Revue des études slaves*, 63 (1991), pp. 20-21; there are at least six Slavonic translations of this *confessio fidei*, on five see *ibidem*, pp. 22-28; for the sixth see D. HAJDUK-VELJKOVIĆ, *Zum Libellus de fide orthodoxa des Michael Synkellos in der kirchenslavischen Überlieferung*, in *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie*, 57 (1998), pp. 28-49.

10. *De sex sanctis et oecumenicis synodis* is an anonymous account of the first six Councils with a summary of their decisions and the names of the principal protagonists (BHG 2341b). This anonymous account complements Michael Syncellus' *Libellus*, in which the six Councils are enumerated but the decisions are not summarized. Since it has not been traced elsewhere the account may have been compiled especially for the florilegium.⁸⁵

B. Anastasius of Sinaita, *Interrogationes et responsiones*

The selection and order of the 88 questions in the collection is not haphazard but logical and the contents can be divided into two main parts:

A. The first 23 QQ all go back to the genuine Anastasian collection and deal with practical matters of the Christian life: 1-2: the marks of a true Christian; 3-4: sin and forgiveness; 5: salvation is for all, not only for monks; 6: confession; 7: communion; 8: fornication; 9-10: punishment for sin; 11-15: the proper use of worldly riches; 16: obedience due to secular authorities; 17: misfortune in life; 18: sudden death; 19: belief in fate; 20: foretelling the future; 21: death; 22: prayer and masses for the dead; 23: the nature of paradise.

B. QQ 24-88, only nine of which go back to the genuine collection, viz. QQ 39-40, 55-56, 70-71, 73-74 and 81, contain answers to questions which could occur to a Christian reading Scripture intelligently, e.g. Q 37: Why was Moses prohibited from entering the Promised Land only because of a minor sin? Q 74: Since Christ stated that we are not defiled by what we eat, why should we not eat meat during fasts? These questions too are not arranged completely haphazardly: QQ 24-53 basically follow the order of the books of the Old Testament, while QQ 54-88 follow the order of the New Testament, although those on the Epistles, QQ 54-59, precede those

⁸⁵ The sole edition of the Greek text, Е. БАРСОВ - А. ДЮВЕРНУА, *Изборник великого князя Святослава Ярославича 1073 года. С греческим и латинским текстами*, in *Чтения в Императорском Обществе истории и древностей российских*, 1882/4 [123], pp. 55-62, is totally unreliable, see THOMSON, *Traductions* [see note 84], pp. 23-24. ТРОИЦКИ, *Крмчију* [see note 47], p. 76, incorrectly identified the entry as Germanus I of Constantinople's *De sex synodis oecumenicis*, ed. G. VOELLUS - H. JUSTELLUS, *Bibliotheca iuris canonici veteris in duos tomos distributa* [...], Paris, 1661, ii, pp. 1161-1165. The fact that neither Michael's *Libellus* nor the anonymous account lists the seventh Council at Nicaea in 787 is irrelevant for the dating of the compilation of the florilegium since the oecumenical status of the Second Nicaean Council was only recognized after the final restoration of iconodulia in 843, see G. DUMEIGE, *Nicée II (Histoire des Conciles Œcuméniques, 4)*, Paris, 1978, pp. 177-189. Indeed, it is first referred to as the seventh "Oecumenical" Council in the Synodicon of Orthodoxy in an addition condemning the heresies of John Italus (c. 1025-after 1082), ed. J. GOUILLARD, *Le synodicon de l'Orthodoxie. Édition et commentaire*, in *TM*, 2 (1967), pp. 45-107; for the condemnation of John see pp. 57-61, especially p. 59.

on the Gospels, QQ 60-87, which presumably reflects the influence of the liturgy, in which the epistle is read before the gospel. The final question (Q 88) dealing with the outward form, τύπος, of the Church and the use of symbolic language in describing sacred things, e.g. the sanctuary as the soul and the nave as the body, forms the introduction to the third section.

C. Appendices:

1. Theodore of Raithu, *De eisdem*, is a small treatise with definitions of philosophical concepts such as essence, nature, accident, substance, species and difference.⁸⁶ The title, Περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν, refers back to the preceding entry in the florilegium, viz. the final appendix to Q 88, *De differentia substantiae et naturae secundum externos philosophos* attributed to Maximus Confessor, which deals with the difference between the concepts of essence and nature.⁸⁷ Despite the ascription to Theodore only approximately 45% of the contents of the treatise have been taken from the second, dialectical part of his *Praeparatio* (CPG 7600), while another 45% are based on John of Damascus' *Dialectica* (CPG 8041).⁸⁸ The remaining 10% may well be original.

2. Maximus Confessor, *De essentia et substantia*, continues the series of definitions of philosophical concepts. The ending is untraced and the rest is not by Maximus but consists of two excerpts from John of Damascus' *Contra Iacobitas* (CPG 8047).⁸⁹

3. Maximus Confessor, *Unionum definitiones* (CPG 7697, § 18), in which ten types of union are defined.⁹⁰

4. George Choïroboscus, *De tropis poeticis*. This is an abridged version of the original treatise on twenty-seven figures of speech, which was included for the correct interpretation of figurative language used in the Bible and not because of any interest in literary theory.⁹¹

⁸⁶ Ed. J. JOHANNET, *Les chapitres de définitions philosophiques dans l'Izbornik de 1073. (Édition gréco-slave)*, in *Revue des études slaves*, 63 (1991), pp. 63-105.

⁸⁷ The final appendix to Q 88 ed. *ibidem* pp. 61-62.

⁸⁸ For the originals see ed. F. DIEKAMP, *Analecta Patristica. Texte und Untersuchungen zur griechischen Patristik* (OCA, 117), Rome, 1938, pp. 200-222, and PG 94, cols 521-676, respectively.

⁸⁹ Ed. JOHANNET, *Chapitres* [see note 86], pp. 106-109, cf. PG, 94, cols 1441-1444 and 1468.

⁹⁰ Critical edition by JOHANNET, *Chapitres* [see note 86], pp. 110-111; for a slightly variant recension see PG, 91, cols 213-216. See also P. VAN DEUN, *L'Unionum definitiones* (CPG 7697, 18) attribué à Maxime le Confesseur: *Étude et édition*, in *REB*, 58 (2000), pp. 123-147.

⁹¹ Ed. J. BESHAROV, *Imagery of the Igor' Tale in the Light of Byzantino-Slavic Poetic Theory* (*Studies in the Russian Epic Tradition*, 2), Leiden, 1956, pp. 4-42; the original version ed. L. SPENGEL, *Rhetores Graeci* (*Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana*), 3 vols, Leipzig, 1853-1856, iii, pp. 244-256.

5. Epiphanius of Salamis, *Ex Panario*, deals with the use of allegory in the Bible as illustrated by the epithets of lion and lamb applied to Christ. No direct source has been traced and it was probably compiled under the influence of similar ideas about Christ as lion and lamb expressed in the *Panarium* (CPG 3745).⁹²

6. Pseudo-Gregory of Nazianzus, *Dialogus inter S. Basilium et S. Gregorium Theologum de invisibili Dei essentia* (CPG 3067). This is an erotapocritic collection of 23 QQ allegedly put by Basil of Caesarea to Gregory about the metaphorical meaning of phrases such as “to see God” or “God appeared to” in the Bible.⁹³

7. This consists of a series of seven excerpts taken from Theodoret of Cyrillus’ *Haereticarum fabularum compendium* (CPG 6223) chosen to show that the concepts of one God, two natures of Christ and three persons of the Trinity are not contradictory.⁹⁴

8. An excerpt of Irenaeus of Lyons’ *Contra haereses libri quinque* (CPG 1306) dealing with the difference between the breath of life, $\pi\nu\omicron\iota\eta\ \zeta\omega\eta\varsigma$, which God breathed into Adam to make him a living soul (Genesis 2:7), and the Holy Spirit, $\tau\omicron\ \text{“}\text{\AA}\gamma\iota\omicron\nu\ \Pi\nu\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\mu\alpha$.⁹⁵

9. Augustine, *Ex dogmaticis*, which deals with three Trinitarian metaphors of fire, rainbow and man. The first is a Greek translation of a passage taken from Vigilius of Thapso’s *Contra Felicianum Arianum de unitate Trinitatis* (CPL 808),⁹⁶ but the sources of the other two metaphors have not been traced.

10. *Chronotaxis Domini e Constitutionibus apostolicis* (BHG 779j), which despite its title is not found in the Apostolic Constitutions and deals with the exact days and hours on which the major events in Christ’s earthly life took place.⁹⁷

⁹² Ed PG 42, cols 257 and 280-281.

⁹³ Ed. C. HEINRICI, *Griechisch-byzantinische Gesprächsbücher und Verwandtes aus Sammelhandschriften*, in *Abhandlungen der philologisch-historischen Classe der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, 28, 8 (1911), pp. 32-35.

⁹⁴ Ed. PG 83, cols 441, 448, 453, 457, 477, 480, 481-484.

⁹⁵ Ed. F. THOMSON - J. NORET, *L’évolution de la manière de traduire chez les Slaves au Moyen Âge. Comparaison et édition de deux traductions slavonnes (Xe-XIVe siècles) de passages d’Irénée et d’un Pseudo-Augustin*, in *RHT*, 24 (1994), pp. 324-325; cf. PG 7, cols 1152-1153. This is one of the few surviving fragments of the Greek original.

⁹⁶ Ed. THOMSON - NORET, *Évolution* [see note 95], pp. 325-326; for the Latin original see PL 62, col. 337. The reason for the ascription to Augustine is that Vigilius’ work is in some manuscripts wrongly ascribed to Augustine.

⁹⁷ Ed. PG 1, cols 517-518.

11. *Eusebii, Ex chronicis* (BHG 779mi). This first excerpt from a lost work by Eusebius of Caesarea is devoted to establishing the exact times of the events in the last week of Christ's earthly life.⁹⁸

12. *Eiusdem, Ex eodem*. This second excerpt from the same work is devoted to the Roman, Greek, Egyptian, and Jewish systems of dividing the year and their relevance for the dates of events in Christ's earthly life.⁹⁹

13. Hesychius of Jerusalem, *In Christi natalem* (CPG 6595; BHG 779mj). Although ascribed to Hesychius of Jerusalem († after 450) this entry on the exact date of Christ's birth is one of the surviving fragments of the *Historia romana et universalis* by the last pagan Byzantine historian, Hesychius of Miletus († after 582).¹⁰⁰

14. John of Damascus, *De mensibus macedonicis ex ecclesiastica traditione* (CPG 8087, § 11). This brief treatise on the signs of the zodiac is made up of three passages taken from c. 21 of his *De fide orthodoxa* (CPG 8043).¹⁰¹

15. John of Damascus, *De mensibus diversis*. The entry is divided into five sections giving the Roman, Jewish, Macedonian, Hellenic and Egyptian names of the months. The first section with the Latin names includes some brief dietary rules, such as "April 30: do not eat turnips", "December 31: do not eat cabbage", "January 31: at the second hour drink a little unmixed wine".¹⁰²

16. A slightly abridged version of the Decalogue as in Exodus 20:1-17 (as opposed to that in Deuteronomy 5:6-21).

17. The list of canonical books of the Bible found in c. 90 of John of Damascus' *De fide orthodoxa*.¹⁰³

18. A second *index librorum canonicorum*, this time taken from Gregory of Nazianzus' *Carmen dogmaticum XII. De veris Scripturae libris* (CPG 3034, § 12).¹⁰⁴

19. Isidore of Pelusium, *De sexaginta libris et quinam extra illos sint*. This *index librorum canonicorum et prohibitorum* lists the books of the Old

⁹⁸ Ed. PG 92, col. 1053.

⁹⁹ Ed. PG 92, cols 1053-1057. Except for some fragments the Greek original of Eusebius' *Chronicorum libri duo* (CPG 3494) has been lost and the work only survives in an Armenian version, for a Latin translation of which see PG 19, cols 101-598, and Jerome's revised and expanded Latin translation of the second part, ed. PL 27, cols 223-508. However, the texts of appendices 11 and 12 do not correspond to any passages found in the fragments or the translations and their source(s) remain(s) uncertain.

¹⁰⁰ Ed. PG 92, col. 1057; 93, col. 1449, and 97, cols 44-45.

¹⁰¹ Ed. PG 95, col. 236, cf. *De fide orthodoxa*, ed. PG 94, cols 889-892.

¹⁰² Ed. PG 95, cols 236-237. In Greek manuscripts it follows the previous excerpt from the *De fide orthodoxa* but is not taken from there and its source is unknown.

¹⁰³ Ed. PG 94, cols 1177-1180.

¹⁰⁴ Ed. PG 37, cols 472-474, and 138, col. 924.

and New Testaments (omitting Revelation), the Deuterocanonical Books and twenty-five *pseudepigrapha*.¹⁰⁵

20. Epiphanius of Salamis, *Elenchus LXXII prophetarum et X prophetis-sarum* (CPG 3779; BHG 1591a).¹⁰⁶

21. Epiphanius of Salamis, *De XVI prophetarum vita et obitu* (CPG 3778; BHG 1587).¹⁰⁷ Despite the title the entry deals with eighteen not sixteen prophets, viz. the twelve Minor Prophets followed by Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Daniel numbered 13 to 16, while the final two, Elijah and Elisha, are numbered separately 1 and 2 as they do not have Biblical books.

22. Hippolytus of Rome, *De XII apostolis, ubinam quisque eorum praedicaverit ac ubi consummatus sit* (CPG 1911; BHG 153a).¹⁰⁸ Despite the title the entry includes thirteen apostles, viz. the twelve disciples and Paul.

23. Hippolytus of Rome, *De LXX apostolis* (CPG 1911; BHG 153b).¹⁰⁹

24. The concluding doxology.

[25]. In three of the Greek manuscripts, viz. *Coislinianus* 120, *Ottobonianus graecus* 414 and *Athous*, *Laura* Γ 115, the doxology is followed by three chronological lists, first of patriarchs (including popes), then of Assyrian, Jewish and Greek kings and finally of Roman and Byzantine emperors, in each of which the length of the reign or tenure of office is specified for each person. Since the lists are not found in four of the five tenth-century manuscripts they are clearly an early addition to the original corpus of the florilegium, which ended with the doxology.¹¹⁰ As the first chronological list in appendix 20 begins with Adam and ends with Our Lady, while the

¹⁰⁵ Ed. PG 1, cols 515-517. In Greek it is found both as an anonymous work and ascribed to Isidore, who is usually considered to be Isidore of Pelusium († after 431), which, if correct, means that it is the earliest such index.

¹⁰⁶ Ed. T. SCHERMANN, *Prophetarum vitae fabulosae, indices apostolorum discipulorumque Domini Dorotheo, Epiphanio, Hippolyto, aliisque vindicatae* [...] (BSGRT), Leipzig, 1907, pp. 1-3. The original list of seventy-two prophets began with Adam and ended with the old man of Bethel (I Kings 13:11) but at some early date the name of Agabus, who twice prophesied (Acts 11:28 and 21:10-11), was appended to the list, thus making seventy-three prophets.

¹⁰⁷ Ed. PG 43, cols 415-426.

¹⁰⁸ Ed. PG 10, cols 952-953.

¹⁰⁹ Ed. PG 10, cols 953-957.

¹¹⁰ The Greek list ed. БИБИКОВ, *Протомун* [see note 69], pp. 261-263, and IDEM, *Сравнительный анализ состава "Изборника Святослава 1073 г." и его византийских аналогов*, in VV, 51 (1990), pp. 99-100. In *Coislinianus* 120 owing to the loss of a folio the list of Roman and Byzantine emperors breaks off with Emperor Pertinax (1 January-28 March 193). The list of the Byzantine emperors without the Roman ones is also found in *codex Laurentianus Pluteus* IV.6 of the eleventh century, in which it was added by a later hand; on the manuscript see BANDINI, *Catalogus* [see note 71], pp. 524-525, and БИБИКОВ, *Протомун* [see note 69], p. 67. Another tenth-century witness to the lists is the Slavonic translation, which has the list of Roman and Byzantine emperors, on this see below.

last of these three lists begins with Julius Caesar (49-45 B.C.) and ends with Constantine VII (913-959), the intention was clearly to portray history from Creation to the contemporary era as *Heilsgeschichte*, the revelation in history of God's will for the salvation of mankind.

The earliest extant manuscript of the Slavonic translation of the florilegium was copied at Kiev in 1073 and was discovered in the New Jerusalem Monastery of the Resurrection near Moscow by Joseph Dobrowsky (1753-1829), the father of Slav philology, in late 1792.¹¹¹ Russian interest in the translation was aroused by the fact that after the concluding doxology on f. 263v the manuscript contains on ff. 263v-264r a eulogy of Prince Svyatoslav of Kiev (1073-1076) written in twenty-seven dodecasyllabic lines of iambic trimeters in which the prince is credited with ordering the translation to be made.¹¹² However, in 1847 Stepan Shevyrev (1806-1864), a literary critic who lectured at the University of Moscow, discovered another copy of the florilegium of the late fifteenth century in the library of the Dormition Monastery founded by St Cyril of Belozero (1337-1427), the particular interest of which is that on f. 6v it has the sole copy of the original form of the eulogy with a dedication to Tsar Symeon of Bulgaria, which Shevyrev published in 1850 with a brief description of the manuscript.¹¹³ In

¹¹¹ The most detailed account of the discovery was published in 1990 by Г. МОИСЕЕВА - М. КРБЕЦ, *Йосиф Добровский и Россия (Памятники русской культуры XI-XVIII веков в изучении чешского слависта)*, Ленинград, 1990, pp. 120-124. Despite this the claim that it was discovered by Konstantin Kalaydovich (1792-1832) in June 1817 is still being repeated, e.g. in 2008 by П. ЯНЕВА - С. ИВАНОВ, *Спасителна книга. (Гръцкият оригинал на Симеоновия сборник). Книга, произхождаща и съставена от различни речи и душеполезни разкази, наречена "Спасителна"*, София, 2008, p. 5. Slobodan Fomić was oft heard to repeat the Latin adage: *Id quod volunt, credunt quoque*.

¹¹² There is an excellent diplomatic edition of the codex, ed. П. ДИНЕКОВ, *Симеонов сборник (по Светославовия препис от 1073 г.)*, 2 vols, София, 1991-1993, i, pp. 201-725, for the eulogy see pp. 720-721; see also the superb reproduction of the codex in facsimile, ed. Б. РЫБАКОВ, *Изборник Святослава 1073 года. Факсимильное издание*, Москва, 1983, ff. 1r-266v, for the eulogy see ff. 263v-264r. The manuscript is now *codex* 1043 (*olim* 31D) in the collection of the Russian Synod in the State History Museum, Moscow; on the codex with a bibliography see Л. ЖУКОВСКАЯ (ред.), *Сводный каталог славяно-русских рукописных книг, хранящихся в СССР. XI-XIII вв.*, Москва, 1984, pp. 36-40; on the manuscript itself as opposed to the text see A. DŽUROVA, *Le Recueil de Svetoslav de 1073 Moscou*, GIM, Sin. 31D No. 1043, in E. KONSTANTINOU (ed.), *Methodios und Kyrillos in ihrer europäischen Dimension (Philhellenische Studien, 10)*, Frankfurt am Main, 2005, pp. 271-312.

¹¹³ See С. ШЕВЫРЕВ, *Поездка в Кирилло-белозерский монастырь. Вакационные дни профессора С. Шевырева в 1847 году*, 2 vols, Москва, 2009, ii, pp. 235-237; for the eulogy see pp. 236; the manuscript is now *codex* 5/1082 (*olim* 118/52) in the monastery's collection in the Russian National Library, Saint Petersburg; on it see L. MASING, *Studien zur Kenntnis des Izbornik Svjatoslava vom Jahre 1073 nebst Bemerkungen zu den jüngeren Handschriften*, in *Archiv für slavische Philologie*, 8 (1885), pp. 371-389, with an edition of the eulogy on pp. 374-375, and Н. РОЗОВ, *О датировке и локализации Кирилло-*

the eulogy on f. 263v of the 1073 codex the name Svyatoslav has been written over an erasure and in 1979 an optico-photographic examination established that the words “among princes prince Svyatoslav” in the first two lines of the eulogy were written over a large erasure precisely where in the eulogy in the Dormition codex the words “among emperors Symeon” are written, so that there can be no doubt but that the dedication to Svyatoslav is secondary.¹¹⁴ The eulogy reads as follows:¹¹⁵

Great among emperors Symeon, mighty lord, having desired with a great desire to reveal the ideas concealed in the depth of this most obscure book⁽¹⁾ of Basil, most wise in the(se) ideas, commanded me, a good-for-nothing in learning,⁽²⁾ to make the change of the language in another way (while) preserving the identity of his⁽³⁾ ideas, which he,⁽⁴⁾ having collected like an industrious bee from every flower of the work⁽⁵⁾ into his magnanimous heart as if into one honeycomb, pours like sweet honey from his lips before the nobles for the instruction of their minds, seeming to them a new Ptolemy,⁽⁶⁾ not by religion⁽⁷⁾ but rather by desire⁽⁸⁾ and on account of the collection of all the most venerable divine books by which he, having filled even his palace, made for himself an eternal remembrance. May the reason for receiving (this) remembrance⁽⁹⁾ be for his Christian soul the reward of a crown of blessed and holy men in the infinite age of ages. Amen.

(1) Since the word for book, *k" nigy*, is *plurale tantum* the plural *books* is also possible since it refers to a florilegium with varied contents.

(2) Literally *knowledge*.

(3) Viz. Basil's. The impossibility of distinguishing between *svoi* (*suus*) and *jego* (*eius*) in English leads to ambiguities.

(4) Viz. Symeon.

Белозерского списка Изборника Симеона-Святослава, in Е. НЕМИРОВСКИЙ (ред.), *Русско-болгарские связи в области книжного дела. Сборник научных трудов (Актуальные проблемы книговедения, 5)*, Москва, 1981, pp. 22-35, with a facsimile edition of the eulogy on p. 34. In the 1073 codex the eulogy is in fact found twice, not only on ff. 263v-264r but also on f. 2v-r (sic!), ed. ДИНЕКОВ, *Сборник* [see note 112], i, pp. 202-201. The text on ff. 263v-264r has better preserved the original form of the eulogy than either that on f. 2v-r or that on ff. 6v in the Dormition codex since only on ff. 263v-264r has the verse form in twenty-seven dodecasyllabic lines in iambic trimeters been preserved.

¹¹⁴ The examination unfortunately failed to reveal any of the erased text, see Л. ЖУКОВСКАЯ, *Загадки записи Изборника Святослава 1073 года*, in Л. ЖУКОВСКАЯ (ред.), *Древнерусский литературный язык в его отношении к старославянскому*, Москва, 1987, p. 47, and occasional claims to the contrary, e.g. Н. ГАГОВА, *Царската библиотека в Преслав и нейната съдба*, in А.-М. ТОТОМАНОВА - Т. СЛАВОВА (ред.), *Нъстъ оученикъ надъ оучителемъ своимъ. Сборник в чест на проф. дфн Иван Добрев, член-корреспондент на БАН и учител*, София, 2005, pp. 171-172, are merely expressions of wishful thinking.

¹¹⁵ The words between brackets have been added for the sense in English. For an edition of the preface with a discussion of the Slavonic terms and their contextual meanings see THOMSON, *Florilegium* [see note 74], pp. 271-276.

⁽⁵⁾ The Slavonic word *p'sanije* could be understood in the sense of *Scripture* but the ideas which Symeon is portrayed as explaining to his nobles are those of the work translated.¹¹⁶

⁽⁶⁾ This is ambiguous: if it refers to Symeon's collection of books it could mean King Ptolemy I Soter (305/4-283/2), who founded the library at Alexandria, but if it refers to both the books and the translation then it means King Ptolemy II Philadelphus (288/5-247/6), who both expanded the library and, according to legend, had the Hebrew scriptures translated into Greek by seventy-two scholars in seventy-two days.

⁽⁷⁾ The word used usually translates πίστις in the sense of *faith* but here it means θρησκεία in the sense of *religion* since Ptolemy was a polytheist.¹¹⁷

⁽⁸⁾ Viz. to reveal the ideas.

⁽⁹⁾ The meaning of this phrase is not absolutely certain since the syntax is obscure and the word *vinō* in addition to being the accusative of *vina*, "reason, cause", could also be an alternative spelling of the adverb *vynō*, "always", in which case the phrase means: *May receiving always (this) remembrance*.¹¹⁸

The Slavonic translation of the florilegium has all of the entries except for the first two chronological lists appended to the concluding doxology, viz. those of popes and patriarchs and of Assyrian, Jewish and Greek kings. Moreover, the third list of Roman and Byzantine emperors is found in only one manuscript, namely, the earliest codex of 1073, in which the doxology and the colophon of the scribe John dated 6581 (1072/3) on f. 263v and the eulogy to Svyatoslav on ff. 263v-264r are followed by the list on ff. 264r-266r. It has been suggested that the reason why it is found after the colophon and the eulogy is that the scribe by mistake omitted it and added it subsequently.¹¹⁹ However, a more likely reason is suggested by the alterations made to the title and the beginning and end of the list by the translator. The title and first two entries read in Greek:

Περὶ τῶν βασιλέων τῶν Ῥωμαίων (variant: Ῥώμης).
α' Ἰούλιος Καῖσαρ ἔτι ε'. β' Αὐγουστος Ὀκταβιανὸς ἀνεψιὸς αὐτοῦ ἔτη
vς'

The last entry varies in the three manuscripts:

Athous, Laura Γ 115:

Ἀλέξανδρος ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ κ(αὶ) α' μῆ(ν) α'

Ottobonianus graecus 414:

Ἀλέξανδρος κ(αὶ) α' μῆ(ν) α' καὶ Κω(σταντῖνος) ὁ υ(ῖο)ς Λέοντος

¹¹⁶ Those to render it by Scripture include T. BUTLER, *Monumenta bulgarica. A Bilingual Anthology of Bulgarian Texts from the 9th to the 19th Centuries* (Michigan Slavic Materials, 41), Ann Arbor, 2004², p. 141, and К. ИВАНОВА - С. НИКОЛОВА, *Тържество на Словото. Златният век на българска книжнина. Летописи, жития, богословие, риторика, поезия*, София, 1995, p. 18. On *p'sanije* in the sense of a "work" see J. KURZ *et al.* (ed.), *Slovník jazyka staroslověnského*, 4 vols, Prague, 1966-1997 [henceforth *SJS*], 3, p. 519.

¹¹⁷ On the rendering of θρησκεία by *věra* see *SJS* 1, pp. 377-378.

¹¹⁸ For examples of the alternative spelling of *vynō* see *SJS* 1, p. 357.

¹¹⁹ See H. LUNT, *On the Izbornik of 1073*, in *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 7 (1983), p. 364, n. 17.

Laurentianus Pluteus IV.6 (in which the list of was added by a later hand):
 Ἀλέξανδρος ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔτος α' ἡμέραι ιε'.¹²⁰

The Slavonic, however, reads in translation:

Concise Chronicle from Augustus right up until the Greek rulers Constantine and Zoe.

Augustus who (is) also Octavianus⁽¹⁾ 56 years, 4 months and one day. In his 43rd year Christ our God was born in the year of the world 5501.⁽²⁾ Alexander alone, 1 year, 25 days.⁽³⁾ Constantine and Zoe, years.¹²¹

(1) The name has been translated by *osmorod'nyi*, “eighth-born”.

(2) Viz. the Alexandrian era and not the Byzantine.

(3) On the number of days see below.

It is significant that the Slavonic list begins not with Julius Caesar but with the emperor at the time of Christ's birth and continues down not to Emperor Alexander but to Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus and Zoe, who were obviously still reigning when the list was compiled since the number of years is not indicated. This would suggest that the original intention had been not to include any of the lists but that it had been subsequently decided to mark the continuity from the time of Christ down to the time of translation and so the list was adapted and added at the end of the translation after the eulogy. The reason why all the other Slav manuscripts except one have preserved neither the eulogy nor the chronological list is obvious: the two entries follow the concluding doxology and hence later scribes concluded that they did not belong to the florilegium and omitted them. Only the scribe of the Dormition codex found the eulogy – but not the list – sufficiently important to preface it to the florilegium.

The list enables the approximate date of the translation to be established. As in the case of all the preceding entries the length of Alexander's reign is specified – incidentally more accurately in the Slavonic translation than in the Lorenzo manuscript as he reigned from 12 May 912 to 6 June 913, although “15 days” instead of “25 days” in the Lorenzo manuscript might be simply a scribal error – but in the final entry “years” has been written without a number. Constantine VII, the son of Leo VI (886-912) and his

¹²⁰ See the list ed. Биби́ков, *Прототип* [see note 69], pp. 261-263, see pp. 261 and 263. Unfortunately, his edition is ambiguous because it contradicts what he says elsewhere, viz. *ibidem*, p. 65, where he states that the last name in the Ottoboni codex is that of Alexander, and *ibidem*, p. 260, where he asserts that Constantine's name is “in copies” of the eleventh century. The lists in the manuscripts have been checked by Dr Sieswerda, see above note 73. On the addition of the list in the Lorenzo manuscript and the fact that the list of emperors in *Coislinianus 120* breaks off with Emperor Pertinax, see above note 110.

¹²¹ Ed. Дине́ков, *Сборник* [see note 112], i, pp. 721-725, see pp. 721 and 725.

fourth wife Zoe Karbonopsina, was born on 17/18 May 905 and crowned co-emperor in May 908. When Alexander died Constantine was only eight and Patriarch Nicholas I Mysticus of Constantinople (901-907, 912-925) was appointed regent but was replaced in that office in February or March 914 by Zoe, who was in turn replaced as regentess in 919/20 by Romanus I Lecapenus (920-944), who had married his daughter Helen to Constantine in May 919. Since Zoe was regentess for Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus (908-959) only from February/March 914 to 919/20 the translation must have been made after February 914 and before Symeon's death on 27 May 927.¹²²

It is sometimes asserted that the Greek florilegium was compiled by Symeon or at his command.¹²³ In theory this is possible as it was compiled between 843 and 877/900 and Symeon was in Constantinople from c. 878-c. 886 but it beggars belief that he should have had the florilegium compiled while he was in Constantinople but not have it translated until after he had assumed the title of tsar many years later in 913. If the florilegium was only compiled at the beginning of the tenth century Symeon could in theory have compiled it after his return to Bulgaria since the author of the eulogy refers to a large collection of books in his palace, viz. at the capital of Preslav, which must have included Greek manuscripts since the contents of the "Golden Stream" collection reveal that Symeon had access to many of the works of John Chrysostom which had not been translated. However, the eulogy does not support the theory that Symeon compiled the florilegium since the author – unlike the author of the preface to the "Golden Stream" collection – makes no mention of Symeon having compiled it but only that the tsar had commanded it to be translated. It has also been suggested that although Symeon did not compile the florilegium he adapted its contents to Bulgarian requirements by omitting entries which he considered "unsuitable".¹²⁴ This idea is, however, contradicted by the

¹²² Not before 919/20 as it is uncertain whether the translator would have made an addition to the list in the Greek manuscript which he was using for the translation.

¹²³ E.g. by П. ДИМИТРОВ, *Около предисловието и названието на «Златоструй»*, in *Език и литература*, 35, 2 (1980), p. 28; Е. ГЕОРГИЕВ, *К вопросу о возникновении и составителях Изборника Симеона-Святослава, известного по рукописи 1073 г.*, in Б. РЫБАКОВ (ред.), *Изборник Святослава 1073 года. Сборник статей*, Москва, 1977, p. 271-272, and Р. ЗЛАТАНОВА, *Към синтаксиса на Симеоновия сборник по преписа от 1073 г.*, in *Годишник на Софийския университет "Св. Климент Охридски". Научен център за славяно-византийски проучвания "Иван Дуйчев"*, 1 (1987 [изд. 1990]), p. 284. This author himself formerly considered it "not entirely impossible", see F. THOMSON, *The Symeonian Florilegium – Problems of Its Origin, Content, Textology and Edition, together with an English Translation of the Eulogy of Tzar Symeon*, in: *Palaeobulgarica*, 17, 1 (1993), p. 46.

¹²⁴ Thus К. КУЕВ, *Археографски бележки за разпространението на Симеоновия (Светославовия) сборник в старите славянски литератури*, in *Старобългарска*

textual evidence since all the Greek manuscripts – including the *codices descripti* – have at least minor differences with regard to their contents. Moreover, the contents of the Slavonic translation are almost identical to those of *codex Parisinus Coislinianus* 120 of the early tenth century so that there is no reason to believe that the minor differences between the contents of the translation and those of that Greek manuscript are other than Greek in origin.¹²⁵

There nevertheless remains a problem, namely, that the author of the eulogy refers to the work that he has translated as “this most obscure book of Basil”, a phrase which scarcely fits the contents of the florilegium. At least four theories have been advanced in attempts to solve the problem. (1) The author mentions Basil because the latter was one of the greatest of the Fathers and “a giant of Christian thought”.¹²⁶ Basil was indeed a leading Father but it is hardly a convincing explanation if only for the fact that the other two Cappadocian Fathers are also among the contributors to the florilegium. (2) The eulogy was not intended for a book by Basil but was merely a eulogy for some special occasion and was later copied into a manuscript which just happened to be the florilegium.¹²⁷ This is even more implausible in view of the fact that the author of the eulogy specifically refers to “this...book”. (3) It was written by the early Bulgarian author John the Exarch (fl. early tenth century) for his *Hexaemeron*, which is largely based upon Basil of Caesarea’s *Homiliae IX in Hexaemeron* (CPG 2835).¹²⁸ This too is unacceptable since the author of the eulogy specifically states that he had been instructed to translate a specific work, whereas in the preface to his *Hexaemeron* John makes it quite clear that his *Hexaemeron* is not a translation but a compilation from various sources made by several people including himself.¹²⁹ Moreover, the picture painted in the

литература, 5 (1979), p. 41 (*nepodhodjašti*). Unfortunately he did not explain what precisely he meant by this.

¹²⁵ For a comparative table of the contents of the twenty-one Greek codices and those of the 1073 codex see БИБИКОВ, *Протоитин* [see note 69], pp. 248-255.

¹²⁶ Thus К. КУЕВ, *Похвалата на цар Симеон – реконструкция и разбор*, in *Старобългаристика*, 10, 2 (1986), p. 20.

¹²⁷ It was suggested by М. СПАСОВА, *Още веднъж за похвалата на цар Симеон*, in *Българистични проучвания*, 3 (1998), p. 45. The conjecture by А. ЛЬВОВ, *Исследование Похвалы великому князю Святославу и царю Симеону*, in В. ДЕМЬЯНОВ - В. ДУБРОВИНА (ред.), *История русского языка. Исследования и тексты*, Москва, 1982, p. 176, that the word “this” is an interpolation must be rejected since its omission would destroy the dodecasyllabic structure of the line.

¹²⁸ See З. ХАУПТОВА, *Похвала царю Симеону, ее автор и византийские образцы*, in *Старобългарска литература*, 10 (1981), pp. 89-90.

¹²⁹ Ed. R. AITZETMÜLLER, *Das Hexaemeron des Exarchen Johannes (Editiones monumentorum slavicae veteris dialecti)*, 7 vols, Graz, 1958-1975, i, p. 43:

“These six homilies, my lord, we did not compose ourselves, (1) taking partly the very words from the Hexaemeron of St Basil and partly the ideas from it, (2) and also from John,

eulogy of Symeon expounding the ideas contained in the work to his nobles accords well with the practical advice on the Christian life in the florilegium but not at all with the account of creation in the *Hexaemeron*. (4) The Greek codex used had belonged to the imperial library in Constantinople and in the phrase “this most obscure book of Basil” the term “obscure” means “not easily accessible” (!), while “of Basil” either refers to Emperor Basil I or is a scribal corruption or deliberate alteration of “basileus” in the sense of “imperial”.¹³⁰ This convoluted argumentation is clearly special pleading in favour of a totally unsubstantiated assumption that the Greek codex had come from the imperial library at Constantinople.

The simplest explanation for the reference to “this most obscure book of Basil” is the fact that the titles of both the florilegium and of the first entry in it, viz. the excerpt of Basil of Caesarea’s *Adversus Eunomium*, are written together within the same frame. The seven lines of text within the frame read in translation:

a collection from many fathers · interpreta-
tions of obscure passages⁽¹⁾ ·
in the gospels and epistles⁽²⁾ · and in oth-
er books · briefly compi-
led · for memory and ready an-
swer · ⁽³⁾of saint basil from that (work) ·
against eunomius⁽⁴⁾ on the holy spirit.¹³¹

(1) The word *sloves’h* is ambiguous as it can also mean either “words” or “homilies”.

(2) In Slavonic *apostolē* includes Acts.

(3-4) In Slavonic this phrase reads: *svjataago vasilia ot’ togo eže na eunomia*.

(3) and other (ideas) from others, as we each have read at some time, and thus we have compiled it”.

(1) This is not *pluralis majestatis* since elsewhere in his preface John uses the first person singular, see ed. *ibid.*, p. 5; (2) Or: *from him*.; (3) Viz. Severian of Gabala’s *In mundi creationem homiliae sex* (CPG 4194), which are in many Greek codices ascribed to John Chrysostom.

¹³⁰ Н. ГАГОВА, *Южнославянските владетелски сборници в огледалото на православно владетел: концепцията и функцията на Симеоновия сборник, отражен в Изборника от 1073 г.*, in В. ГЮЗЕЛЕВ - А. МИЛТЕНОВА - Р. СТАНКОВА (ред.), *България и Сърбия в контекста на византийската цивилизация. Сборник статии от българо-сръбски симпозиум 14-16 септември 2003*, София, 2005, pp. 382-384.

¹³¹ In *codex* 5/1082 of the Dormition monastery the text of the title on f. 7r is perfectly legible but in the 1073 codex it is now partly illegible, although more of it was still decipherable in 1880 when a photolithographic edition was made, ed. Г. КАРПОВ, *Изборник великого князя Святослава 1073 г.* (Издание Императорского Общества любителей древней письменности, 55), Санкт-Петербург, 1880, pp. 1-532, see p. 7. The English translation is based on the edition in THOMSON, *Florilegium* [see note 74], p. 287, which takes the variants of several manuscripts into consideration.

The author of the eulogy seems not to have realized that the title of the florilegium ended with the word “answer” and took all of the text within the frame to form part of the title and therefore ascribed the book to Basil. Indeed, even if the titles were not in a frame in the archetype it could have been assumed that the two consecutive titles were in fact two parts of one and the same title. This, of course, implies that the author of the eulogy considered that St Basil (329/330-379) had compiled the collection, which at first sight seems to imply that he was not acquainted with its contents as it contains excerpts from writings by persons who lived centuries after Basil, to mention but Michael Syncellus (c. 760-846) and Patriarch Nicephorus I of Constantinople (806-815, † 828). There are, however, two possible explanations for this: either he was indeed not personally acquainted with the contents and his statement that he had been instructed by Symeon to translate the book is to be understood in the sense that he had been commanded to have it translated and had entrusted the actual work to others,¹³² or else, if he was acquainted with the contents and had translated them, he considered that the catenary nature of the collection, like that of many florilegia, meant that later additions had been made to the original Basilian contents. Be that as it may, there is no evidence to support a claim that the association of the translation with Symeon is unhistorical since the Greek codex used for the translation was copied between 914 and 919/920 and Symeon only died in 927.

The claim that the florilegium is “an encyclopaedia of contemporary Byzantine learning” is an exaggeration¹³³ since it is clearly addressed to ordinary clergy and literate laity and can thus only be called an encyclopaedia in the sense of being “Everyman’s Encyclopaedia of the Christian Faith and Life” and as such the contents of the florilegium were eminently suited to the needs not only of the newly converted Bulgarians but also of all the other South and East Slav peoples who were subsequently converted. It has rightly been stated that the Pseudo-Anastasian collection “is an especially important work for cultural history and gives a profound insight into the ‘popular theology’ of the time, which has unfortunately not as yet been fully exploited.”¹³⁴

¹³² The causative use of the active voice is common in Slavonic and hence SIESWERDA, *Σωτήριος* [see note 75], p. 326, is incorrect in concluding that “the author of the eulogy is not, as he pretends to be, the translator”.

¹³³ The claim was made by К. КУЕВ, *Симеоновият сборник и неговите потомци*, in *Годишник на Софийския университет. Факултет по славянски филологии*, 67, 2 (1972 [изд. 1974]), p. 5, who elsewhere talked of “a florilegium reflecting the entire contemporary Byzantine dogmatic, moral, humanist, legal, cultural, literary-theoretical etc. thought” (!), see IDEM, *Поява и разпространение на Симеоновия сборник*, in П. ДИНЕКОВ (ред.), *Симеонов сборник (по Светославовия препис от 1073 г.)*, vol. 1, София, 1991, p. 34.

¹³⁴ BECK, *Kirche* [see note 69], p. 444: “ein kulturgeschichtlich besonders wichtiges, leider noch nicht ausgeschöpftes Werk, das eine tiefe Einsicht in die ‘Volkstheologie’ der Zeit bietet”. This statement made in 1959 is unfortunately still true today.

Symeon had instructed the translator to preserve the ideas of the original while changing the language, which the translator(s) did by keeping close to the Greek even in word order. Since the underlying Greek text is stylistically fairly simple the closeness of the Slavonic to it does not affect the comprehensibility except in two specific entries. The first appendix based on Theodore of Raithu's *Praeparatio* and John of Damascus' *Dialectica* contains definitions of philosophical concepts and the translation is obscure because Slavonic did not yet have a stable philosophical terminology and hence the same Greek term was often rendered by more than one Slavonic term, e.g. ὁρισμὸς not only by *razlučenije* and *ot" lučenije* but also by *ustav*", while on the other hand more than one Greek term was rendered by the same Slavonic one, e.g. both σύστασις and στοιχεῖον by *s" stav*". It is, however, the fourth appendix, George Choïroboscus' short treatise explaining twenty-seven figures of speech, which is not merely obscure but in places totally incomprehensible. The terminology is confusing since not merely are some terms mistranslated, e.g. ἐπανάληψις, *repetition*, by *porečenije*, which implies that the translator understood ἐπίληψις, *reprimand*, but because once again the same term is sometimes used to render two Greek terms, e.g. παράδειγμα and ἐπίθετον by *prilog*", and two Slavonic terms are used for the same Greek term, e.g. *s" vratosloviye* and *okrugosloviye* to render περίφρασις. It is scarcely surprising that there is no trace of the slightest influence of George Choïroboscus' treatise on any Slav work and claims to the contrary have rightly been rejected as "totally nonsensical".¹³⁵ With these two exceptions the translation is on the whole comprehensible.

That the translation did indeed play a significant role throughout the Slav world in the teaching of the faith is proved by its wide distribution.¹³⁶ The twenty-seven complete copies can be divided into three redactions. All the

¹³⁵ See R. MARTI, Review of AVENARIUS, *Kultur*, in *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen*, 254 (2002), p. 86: "völlig unsinnig", made with regard to the claim to the contrary by A. AVENARIUS, *Die byzantinische Kultur und die Slaven. Zum Problem der Rezeption und Transformation (6. bis 12. Jahrhundert)* (Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung, 35), Vienna, 2000, p. 202. There are certain similarities between the rhetorical terminology of George Choïroboscus' treatise and that of the translator of the works of Dionysius the Areopagite, Isaiah of Serrai, in the second half of the fourteenth century, see S. FAHL, D. FAHL and J. HARNEY, *Das nicht Aussagbare in eine nicht vorhandene Sprache übersetzen. Beobachtungen am Übersetzerautograph des Starec Isaiah*, in H. GOLTZ - G. PROCHOROV (eds), *Das Corpus des Dionysios Areiopagites in der slavischen Übersetzung von Starec Isaija (14. Jahrhundert)*, Band 5 (*Monumenta linguae slavicae dialecti veteris Fontes et Dissertationes*, 61), Freiburg im Breisgau, 2013, pp. 428-431. It is not, however, causal but coincidental.

¹³⁶ The best surveys of the many manuscripts are those by КУЕВ, *Сборник* [see note 133], pp. 1-48, and IDEM, *Поява* [see note 133], pp. 34-98.

manuscripts of the complete redaction with all the entries are East Slav except for one seventeenth-century Moldavian codex.¹³⁷ However, the text of the ἐρωταποκρίσεις in this redaction has the peculiarity that four brief passages taken from the earliest Slavonic translation of Gregory of Nazianzus' *Oratio XL. In sanctum baptisma* (CPG 3010, § 40; BHG 1947g) are found interpolated into the answer to Q 20.¹³⁸ The South Slav redaction is found in two Serbian manuscripts of the fourteenth century, *codex Hilandaricus* 382 and *codex* 72 in the collection of the Rumanian Academy, and one Wallachian of the sixteenth, *codex* 310 in the same collection. This redaction has preserved an excellent text of the ἐρωταποκρίσεις without the interpolation and also has all of the appendices but the ten prefaces have been replaced by nine completely different ones.¹³⁹ The third, short redaction is found in three late East Slav manuscripts, the earliest of which is fifteenth-century *codex* 6 in the collection of Count Nikolay Rumyantsev, now in the State Library of Russia, Moscow. It too has an excellent text of the ἐρωταποκρίσεις not only without the interpolation of the four passages from the Slavonic translation of Gregory of Nazianzus' *Oratio XL* but also with many readings that are better than those in the 1073 codex, although it has one major omission, viz. the ending of R 66 to the beginning of R 70, and three minor ones, viz. passages in RR 1, 15 and 69. It also omits all the prefaces and only preserves five of the appendices, viz. 1 and 6-9.¹⁴⁰

¹³⁷ *Codex* 757 in the collection of Count Aleksey Uvarov, now in the State History Museum, Moscow, which has only preserved the text from the ending of R 22 to the beginning of appendix 21; on the manuscript see И. ЛЕВОЧКИН, *Уваровский список Изборника 1073 года*, in *Советское славяноведение*, 5 (1982), pp. 91-94, and КУЕВ, *Поява* [see note 133], pp. 86-88.

¹³⁸ Ed. ДИНЕКОВ, *Сборник* [see note 112], i, pp. 436-440; on this see М. СПАСОВА, *Откъсите от Слова на Св. Григорий Богослов в Симеоновия сборник (по претписа от 1073 г.). Текстологични и лексикални проблеми*, in К. ПОПКОНСТАНТИНОВ (ред.), *Палеобалканистиката и старобългаристиката. Първи есенни национални четения "Профессор Иван Гълъбов, Велико Търново, 1995*, pp. 43-78, with an edition of the excerpts, see *ibidem* pp. 46-50, 52-58. For the originals see in this order PG 36, 375-377, 373, 373 and 383-385.

¹³⁹ On the Hilandar manuscript see К. ИВАНОВА, *За Хилендарския претпис на първия Симеонов сборник*, in *Старобългарска литература*, 5 (1979), pp. 57-96; on the two in the Rumanian Academy see Г. МИХАИЛА, *Списки сборника царя Симеона в библиотеке Румынской академии*, in *Старобългаристика*, 11, 3 (1987), pp. 3-20 and ИДЕМ, *Две копии Симеонова сборника в библиотеке Румынской академии*, in F. JAKOPIN (red.), *Slovansko jezikoslovje. Nahtigalov zbornik. Prispevki z mednarodnega simpozija v Ljubljani, 30 junija-2 julija 1977*, Ljubljana, 1977, pp. 255-280. The new prefaces need not be listed here.

¹⁴⁰ On the manuscript see А. ВОСТОКОВ, *Описание русских и словенских рукописей Румянцовского Музеума*, Санктпетербург, 1842, pp. 9-10; Л. ГРЯЗИНА - Н. ЩЕРБАЧЕВА, *К текстологии Изборника 1073 года. (По рукописям Государственной библиотеки СССР имени В. И. Ленина)*, in Б. РЫБАКОВ (ред.), *Изборник Святослава 1073 года. Сборник статей*, Москва, 1977, pp. 60-61, 66-67, 72-84; КУЕВ, *Поява* [see note 133],

Besides the 27 manuscripts so far traced, the indirect tradition of the florilegium is very great indeed and there are numerous minor collections of Pseudo-Anastasian QQ. In many cases, as is to be expected, the QQ are found together with QQ from other collections and sometimes also with genuine Anastasian QQ not found in the collection of 88 Pseudo-Anastasian QQ in the florilegium.¹⁴¹ Thus the collection of ἐρωταποκρίσεις in the codex of 1076, which is the earliest witness to the translation of the Athanasian QQ, also contains fourteen QQ ascribed to Anastasius, only three of which have been taken from the florilegium, viz. QQ 1, 5, and 14.¹⁴² Four of the others are genuine Anastasian questions, viz. QQ 6, 30, 34 and 59,¹⁴³ and six are among those which are probably by Anastasius, viz. QQ app. 5, 4, 16, 8, 9 and 14 in that order,¹⁴⁴ while one is a hitherto untraced variant of Q 41 which ends with almost all of another variant of that question, viz. Q app. 10a.¹⁴⁵ The fact that these last seven QQ form one series at the end of the collection in the 1076 codex gives reason to believe that there was an early translation of an even larger collection of them since fourteen QQ added to the Russian nomocanon in the sixteenth century include not only all seven but also two more, viz. QQ app. 6 and 7.¹⁴⁶ Moreover, sixteenth-century *codex* 119 of the monastery of St Nicholas at Mel'tsy, which has many entries taken from the same source as the 1076 codex, contains another two, Q app. 3 and the beginning of Q app. 18.¹⁴⁷

pp. 45-50; MASING, *Studien* [see note 113], pp. 389-395. R is used as the abbreviation for *Responsio*.

¹⁴¹ It should be noted that since the Greek collection of 88 QQ has not been published, the numbering of the QQ in the collection of 154 QQ is still used by scholars for reference purposes with regard to the entries in the collection of 88.

¹⁴² Ed. МУШИНСКАЯ - МИШИНА - ГОЛЫШЕНКО, *Изборник* [see note 12], i, pp. 492-496, 559-565 and 565-568. On the 1076 florilegium see above note 12.

¹⁴³ The Slavonic ed. *ibidem*, pp. 496-505, 518-526, 535-536 and 538-540; for the Greek originals see RICHARD - MUNITIZ, *Anastasii* [see note 68], pp. 12-14, 80-82, 86 and 110.

¹⁴⁴ The Slavonic ed. *op. cit.*, pp. 586-608; the Greek ed. *op. cit.*, pp. 175, 174, 191, 178, 179 and 189-190.

¹⁴⁵ The Slavonic ed. *op. cit.*, pp. 568-586; the Greek texts of Q 41 and Q app. 10a ed. *op. cit.*, pp. 93-95 and 180-183.

¹⁴⁶ They are in the *editio princeps* of the nomocanon published at Moscow in 1650, ff. 622v-633v, and all subsequent editions. For an edition of QQ app. 6 and 7 with the Greek originals see Ж. ЖОАННЕ, *Некоторые неизданные или забытые тексты-источники Изборника 1076 г. и Кормчей книги*, in *Труды Отдела древнерусской литературы*, 46 (1993), pp. 226-228.

¹⁴⁷ Ed. У. ФЕДЕР, *Кънажинъ изборникъ за възпитание канартикина*, 2 vols, Велико Търново, 2008, ii, pp. 216-218; on the manuscript see ИДЕМ, *Мелецкий сборник и история древнеболгарской литературы*, in *Старобългаристика*, 6, 3 (1982), pp. 154-165; for the Greek originals see RICHARD - MUNITIZ, *Anastasii* [see note 68], pp. 173 and 196-197. The monastery's collection is now in the Ukrainian National Library, Kiev.

To list the many examples of QQ of the Pseudo-Anastasian collection of 88 found in manuscripts over the centuries would be virtually impossible since the number can be as little as one or two, e.g. Q 8 is found in the Trinity Laura florilegium of the late twelfth or early thirteenth century which has six Athanasian QQ,¹⁴⁸ while Q 3 is found appended to the fourth century of Maximus Confessor's *Capita de caritate* (CPG 7693) in the fifteenth-century *codex* 644 in the collection of the Russian Synod¹⁴⁹ and QQ 44 and 48 are found as entries in a sixteenth-century florilegium, *codex* 10/262 of the Lithuanian Academy at Vilnius.¹⁵⁰ Many such selections like that in the 1076 *codex* contain both Athanasian and Pseudo-Anastasian QQ, to give but two examples: one of the appendices to a thirteenth-century East Slav patericon is a collection of 11 QQ, the first and last of which are Pseudo-Anastasian, viz. 64 and 22, but the remainder Athanasian in the order 19-20, 22, 25-26, 32-35,¹⁵¹ while *codex Vindobonensis Slavicus* 125, a Serbian florilegium of the sixteenth century, has a collection of 13 QQ, five Pseudo-Anastasian and eight Athanasian.¹⁵² Sometimes QQ from both collections were interpolated into other erotapocritic collections, to give but one example: the collection of 70 ἐρωταποκρίσεις of Theodoret of Cyrrhus' *Quaestiones in Octateuchum* in fact contains five which are not his, viz. Q 64 is Pseudo-Anastasian Q 40 in the florilegium translation,¹⁵³ while QQ 28-29, 33 and 69 are Athanasian, viz. QQ 60, 62, 61 and 66 respectively.¹⁵⁴

If the minor passages appended to the Pseudo-Anastasian answers in the florilegium are also taken into consideration the influence of the translation

¹⁴⁸ Ed. POPOVSKI - THOMSON - VEDER, *Sbornik* [see note 27], pp. 47-48; on the florilegium see above note 27.

¹⁴⁹ On the *codex*, now in the State History Museum, Moscow, see ГОРСКИЙ - НЕВОСТРУЕВ, *Описание* [see note 35], ii, 2, pp. 283-287, for Q 3 see p. 284. Incidentally, one of the appendices to Pseudo-Anastasian R 5 consists of four passages taken from Maximus' *Capita* and one, the second, taken from his *Quaestiones, interrogationes et dubia* (CPG 7689), ed. ДИНЕКОВ, *Сборник* [see note 112], i, p. 310-312; for the originals see PG 90, cols 1040, 789, 1005-1008, 993 and 1021.

¹⁵⁰ On the *codex* see Ф. ДОБРЯНСКИЙ, *Описание рукописей Виленской Публичной Библиотеки, церковно-славянских и русских*, Вильна, 1882, pp. 441-447, see p. 444.

¹⁵¹ It is in *Codex Scaligeri* 74 in Leyden University Library; for a facsimile edition with transcription of the manuscript see W. VEDER, *The Scaliger Paterikon Accompanied by Four Earlier Studies*, 3 vols (*Early Slavic Texts*, 1, 1-3), Zug, 1976-1981, ii, ff. 1v-200r; for the collection see ff. 149v-153v.

¹⁵² On the *codex* see ЯЦИМИРСКИЙ, *Описание* [see note 23], pp. 225-229, and BIRKFELLNER, *Handschriften* [see note 36], pp. 220-224; for the collection on ff. 339v-352r see pp. 228 and 224 respectively.

¹⁵³ Theodoret, ed. ИСТРИН, *Замечания* [see note 31], pp. 83-95, cf. p. 95, and the florilegium, ed. ДИНЕКОВ, *Сборник* [see note 112], i, p. 496.

¹⁵⁴ Theodoret, ed. ИСТРИН, *Замечания* [see note 31], pp. 87, 88 and 95, cf. Athanasius, ed. КУЕВ, *Иван* [see note 21], p. 263.

is truly enormous since they are found in hundreds of manuscripts. The 1076 codex has several, to give but four examples: the first part of the excerpt from John Chrysostom's *Homilia in dimissionem Chananaeae* (CPG 4529) and all of the excerpt of Nilus of Ancyra's *Ad Agathiam monachum Peristeria* (CPG 6047) appended to R 2 are on ff. 234r-v and 231r-233r;¹⁵⁵ the excerpt from John Chrysostom's *Homilia XXXIV in evangelium Johannis* (CPG 4425, § 34) appended to R 6 is on ff. 241v-243r;¹⁵⁶ the passage from John Climacus' *Scala paradisi* (CPG 7852) appended to R 13 is found on ff. 249r-250v, where it has wrongly been ascribed to John Chrysostom.¹⁵⁷ This last excerpt illustrates another phenomenon: many such short passages were included in the synaxarium and are thus in literally hundreds of manuscripts as well as in all printed editions of the synaxarium, the *editio princeps* of which was published at Moscow in 1643, this particular excerpt being found as an anonymous entry for 25th of June under the title "Homily about a Layman".¹⁵⁸ However, not all of the excerpts in the synaxarium are in the florilegium translation: thus, for example, the abridged version of R 17 found as an entry for 28th of April entitled "Homily about Divine Punishments and Wars and Famines" is correctly ascribed to Anastasius but is in a different translation which is already found in synaxaria of the thirteenth century.¹⁵⁹ Some of the appendices to the answers include excerpts from another erotapocritic collection since there are at least nine excerpts from the Basilian rules, one from the *Regulae fusius*

¹⁵⁵ Cf. the 1073 manuscript, where they are on ff. 35r and 35r-v, ed. ДИНЕКОВ, *Сборник* [see note 112], i, pp. 265 and 265-266, and the 1076 manuscript, ed. МУШИНСКАЯ - МИШИНА - ГОЛЫШЕНКО, *Изборник* [see note 12], i, pp. 623-625 and 617-620; for the texts in the florilegium see PG 89, cols 348-349 and 349-352, for the originals see PG 52, col. 453, and 79, col. 829.

¹⁵⁶ Cf. the 1073 manuscript, where it is on f. 48v, ed. ДИНЕКОВ, *Сборник* [see note 112], i, p. 292, and the 1076 manuscript, ed. МУШИНСКАЯ - МИШИНА - ГОЛЫШЕНКО, *Изборник* [see note 12], i, pp. 638-639; for the text in the florilegium see PG 89, col. 380, for the original see PG 59, col. 196.

¹⁵⁷ Cf. the 1073 manuscript, where it is on f. 93r, ed. ДИНЕКОВ, *Сборник* [see note 112], i, p. 381, and the 1076 manuscript, ed. МУШИНСКАЯ - МИШИНА - ГОЛЫШЕНКО, *Изборник* [see note 12], i, pp. 654-656; for the text in the florilegium see PG 89, cols 469-471, for the original see PG 88, col. 640-641.

¹⁵⁸ In this form it was also included under the date of 25 June in the Macarian menologium, see ИОСИФ, *Оглавление* [see note 39], ii, col. 243. The June volume of the menologium has not yet been published.

¹⁵⁹ It too is found in the Macarian menologium under the date of 28 April, ed. С. СЕВЕРЬЯНОВ, *Великие Минеи Чети, собранные всероссийским митрополитом Макарием, Апрель*, Москва, 1916, cols 1121-1122. For a bibliography of early manuscripts see Н. НИКОЛЬСКИЙ, *Материалы для повременного списка русских писателей и их сочинений (X-XI вв.)*, Санкт-Петербург, 1906, p. 171, n. 2.

tractatae (F) and eight from the *Regulae brevius tractatae*.¹⁶⁰ The phrase “at least” is warranted because there are six more excerpts the source of which is specified in the Pseudo-Anastasian appendices as being the *Regulae* but which are not found in the published *recensio vulgata*: in RR 9, 12, 14 and 17 the source is specified as the *Regulae fusius tractatae*, in RR 60 and 63 it is not specified and is presumably the *Regulae brevius tractatae*.¹⁶¹

The erotapocritic *Dialogus inter S. Basilium et S. Gregorium Theologum*, the sixth of the appendices to the Pseudo-Anastasian QQ in the Symeonian florilegium, is also found separately in two abridged recensions.¹⁶² An East Slav florilegium of the late fifteenth or early sixteenth century, *codex* 682 in the collection of the Russian Synod, now in the State History Museum, Moscow, on ff. 167v-171v contains only 13 of the 23 QQ, viz. 1-9, 18, 21-23, some of which are considerably abridged, although to the ending of R 23 (how the angels who visited Abraham and how Our Lord after His resurrection could eat) has been appended a passage on angels, much of which consists of a series of four brief excerpts from the beginning of the *Paleja tolkovaja*, an anti-Jewish polemical commentary on passages of the Old Testament, probably compiled in Russia in the thirteenth century, after which in *codex* 682 follow six Athanasian QQ, viz. 108-112 and 114.¹⁶³

¹⁶⁰ Since neither the Pseudo-Anastasian collection of 88 QQ nor the Studite recension of the *Regulae* has been published these are the numbers in the Migne editions, viz. for the *Regulae* PG 31, cols 889 – 1052 (F) and 1052-1305 (B), and for Pseudo-Anastasius PG 89, cols 312-824: 1. R 18 from F 55, cf. PG 89, col. 465, and 31, cols 1049-1052; 2. R 1 from B 283, cf. PG 89, cols 338-339, and 31, col 1281; 3. R 6 from B 229, 288, 287 and 1, in that order, cf. PG 89, cols 373-377, and 31, cols 1236, 1284-1285, 1233, 376-377; 4. R 9 from B 81, cf. PG 89, cols 429-432, and 31, col. 1140; 5. R 61 from B 261, cf. PG 89, col. 645, and 31, col. 1260; 6. R 67 from B 64, cf. PG 89, cols 692-693, and 31, cols 1125-1128; 7. although it is not specified as Basilian in Greek in R 70 the passage is from B 164, cf. PG 89, col. 696, and 31, 1189 and 1189-1192; 8. R 128 from B 273 and 62, cf. PG 89, col. 781, and 31, cols 1252 and 1124; 9. R 147 from B 273, cf. PG 89, col. 801, and 31, col. 1272.

¹⁶¹ See PG 95, cols 417-420 (R 9), 452-456 (R 12), 465 (R 14), 496 (R 17), 642-645 (R 60) and 657-660 (R 63).

¹⁶² On the Slavonic translation of the *Dialogus* see A. МИЛТЕНОВА, *Erotapokriseis. Съчинения от кратки въпроси и отговори в старобългарската литература*, София, 2004, pp. 151-160.

¹⁶³ For an edition of the texts of *Dialogus* in the 1073 *codex* and the Synodal florilegium in parallel see A. АРХАНГЕЛЬСКИЙ, *Творения Отцов Церкви в древне-русской письменности. Извлечения из рукописей и опыты историко-литературных изучений*, 4 vols, Казан, 1889-1890, i-ii, pp. 93-97; for the passages in the *Paleja tolkovaja* see the edition by A. КАМЧАТНОВ, *Толковая палея*, Москва, 2002, pp. 13-525, see pp. 15-18. The origin of the *Paleja tolkovaja* is much disputed and cannot be examined here. The six Athanasian questions are listed by ГОРСКИЙ - НЕВОСТРУЕВ, *Описание* [see note 35], ii, 3, p. 739, but are not related to the theme of angels: QQ 108-110 are on the Antichrist, 111-112 on heretics and 114 is the old favourite: how will a drowned man eaten by fishes, the fishes by men and the men by lions be bodily resurrected?

A second abridgment is found on ff. 376v-389v of sixteenth-century *codex* 204 in the collection of Count Nikolay Rumyantsev, now in the State Library of Russia, Moscow, where it is again followed by two passages on angels, the second of which is a different excerpt from the *Paleja tolkovaja*.¹⁶⁴

A second, abridged translation of the florilegium called the “Book of Salvation”, βίβλος σωτήριος, was made in the fourteenth century but it can scarcely have had much influence since only two manuscripts have been traced, one of which was destroyed in the Second World War.¹⁶⁵ The surviving manuscript of the second quarter of the fifteenth century is *codex* Wuk 45 in the German State Library, Berlin, where the translation is on ff. 1r-191r.¹⁶⁶ The orthography of the *codex* is Serbian but the text reveals traces of having been copied at some stage from a Bulgarian manuscript. The translation only contains two of the prefaces, viz. 8 and 9. The Pseudo-Anastasian ἐρωταποκρίσεις follow on ff. 6r-174r and have two main characteristics: firstly, QQ 38-39, 43-45, 63, 78-80 and 86 are missing; secondly, the order is QQ 1-17, app. 1;¹⁶⁷ Q 18, app. 1-Q 21, app. 4; QQ 17, app. 2-R 18; QQ 22-88. This order cannot be the result of copying an exemplar with its folia in muddled order since the breaks in

¹⁶⁴ Unfortunately the text of the *Dialogus* in this manuscript has not been edited, nor has it been described in any detail, see ВОСТОКОВ, *Описание* [see note 140], pp. 260-264 (wrongly numbered pp. 270-274), especially p. 261, and АРХАНГЕЛЬСКИЙ, *Творения* [see note 163], i-ii, p. 129, who claims that the first of the two appended passages “apparently” comes from Dionysius Areopagita’s *De coelesti hierarchia*; МИЛТЕНОВА, *Erotapokriseis* [see note 162], p. 160, claims that it is from Dionysius but her claim is based on a misreading of what Archangel’sky actually wrote and requires substantiation.

¹⁶⁵ It was a Serb manuscript of the fifteenth century, *codex* 33 in the Serbian National Library, Belgrade, which was destroyed by bombs in the night of 6-7 April 1941. The ending of the manuscript was missing and it only contained the two prefaces and QQ 1-21 in the same order as in the surviving manuscript; on the *codex* see ЛЬ. СТОЈАНОВИЋ, *Рукописи и старе штампани књиги (Каталог Народне Библиотеке у Београду, 4)*, Београд, 1903, pp. 305-306, and С. МАТИЋ, *Опис рукописа Народне Библиотеке (Посебна издања Српске Академије наука, 191)*, Београд, 1952, pp. 258-262, cf. Д. БОГДАНОВИЋ, *Инвентар ћирилских рукописа у Југославији (XI-XVII века) (Зборник за историју, језик и књижевност, 1 Отдељење, 31)*, Београд, 1982, p. 196, № R 116. On the title βίβλος σωτήριος see above note 75.

¹⁶⁶ The rest of the *codex*, viz. ff. 191r-467v, consists of a miscellany unrelated to the florilegium, the first entry of which is Theophanes Cerameus of Taormina’s *Homilia LX. In illa verba: ‘Intravit Jesus in quoddam castellum’. Dicta est in festo dormitionis sanctissimae Virginis Deiparae (BHG 1161)*. On the *codex* see Б. ЦОНЕВ, *Славянски ръкописи в Берлинската държавна библиотека*, in *Сборник на Българската академия на науките*, 31 (1937), pp. 54-78; ЯЦИМИРСКИЙ, *Описание* [see note 23], i, pp. 433-443, and E. MATTHES, *Katalog der slavischen Handschriften in Bibliotheken der Bundesrepublik Deutschland*, Wiesbaden, 1990, pp. 49-54.

¹⁶⁷ The term ‘appendix’ here applies to the mostly short Biblical and patristic passages appended to the Pseudo-Anastasian answers in support of the arguments.

the middle of the folia are between and not within the appendices and there is no textual loss or confusion within the texts themselves. For the same reason the order cannot be the result of the translation having been made from a Greek codex with its folia in muddled order. The Pseudo-Anastasian corpus is followed on ff. 174r-191r by appendices 1 (only the beginning), 5, 7-12, 16 and 19-22.¹⁶⁸ Since none of the omissions were the result of copying a defective text the abridgment must have been deliberate.

The main impression made by the omissions is that the abridger was interested not so much in dogmatic theology or history as in practical advice on Christian belief and behaviour. Thus the first seven prefaces on the doctrine of the Trinity and the two natures of Christ were omitted but the eighth devoted to the fact that God is apprehended by faith and not reason was retained, as was the ninth, Michael Syncellus' *Libellus de fide orthodoxa*, which is a statement of what a Christian must believe with no discussion of the doctrines themselves. The tenth preface on the heresies condemned by Oecumenical Councils was of no immediate interest and hence omitted. In similar fashion most of the first appendix and all of the second and third with their definitions of philosophical terms used in dogmatic theology were omitted as well as the explanation of figures of speech in the fourth. The fifth appendix on the reason why Christ is called both lion and lamb was presumably retained for reasons of general interest, although the retention of the seventh, eighth and ninth appendices devoted to the Trinity would seem to be out of keeping with the abridger's general approach to his work. The tenth and eleventh appendices as well as the first half of the twelfth dealing with the chronology of Christ's earthly life were retained but not the second half of the twelfth or the thirteenth on the same subject. The fourteenth on the zodiac and the fifteenth with the names of the months in five languages were omitted, while the retention of the sixteenth appendix with the Decalogue corresponds to his retention of Michael Syncellus' *Libellus* as a simple statement about what a Christian must or must not do. That he should omit the seventeenth and eighteenth appendices with their lists of canonical books is explained by the fact that

¹⁶⁸ For a detailed comparison of the two translations see F. THOMSON, *A Comparison of the Contents of the Two Translations of the Symeon Florilegium on the Basis of the Greek Original Texts*, in *Кирило-Методиевски студии*, 17 (2007), pp. 724-751; for an edition of the two translations of Q 23 on the basis of the 1073 codex and *codex Wuk 45* see IDEM, *An Edition and Comparison of Question XXIII of Anastasius Sinaita's Interrogationes et responsiones in the Two Translations of the Symeon Florilegium*, in Л. ТАСЕВА (ред.), *Многократните преводи в южнославянското средновековие. Доклади от международната конференция София, 7-9 юли 2005*, София, 2006, pp. 117-120.

the nineteenth lists both canonical and apocryphal books. He retained the twentieth to twenty-second appendices with the lists of prophets from Adam to Christ but not the twenty-third with the names of the seventy apostles. The fact that the translation does not contain any of the three appended lists of patriarchs, kings and emperors is probably because the Greek manuscript which the abridger was using did not contain them, which perhaps also applies to QQ 38-39 since part of Q 38 and all of Q 39 are missing in two Greek manuscripts.¹⁶⁹ There is, however, no obvious reason for the omission of QQ 43-45, 63, 78-80 and 86. Whether the abridgment was found in the Greek codex used for the translation or was made by the translator must remain an open question. Certainly no Greek codex of the florilegium so far traced has contents similar to those of the second translation.

The fourteenth century also saw the translation of a large collection of genuine Anastasian questions but the number of them varies so much in the manuscripts, which have not as yet been adequately described, let alone examined, that it is impossible to state how many questions were translated.¹⁷⁰ The earliest manuscript with a reasonable number is the same florilegium copied in 1348 for Tsar John Alexander which has the collection of 128 Athanasian QQ. On ff. 160v-182r it has twenty-nine Anastasian QQ in the order 8, 11-12, 15, 18, 25, 98, 33-34, 6, 29-30, 41, 43, 45-46, 48, 51, 92-96, 99-100, 20, 23, 59 and 101.¹⁷¹ The same collection is found in an East Slav manuscript of the late sixteenth or early seventeenth century.¹⁷² The order of the QQ in the Greek original is unsystematic and the order in this collection is no exception. It also illustrates the fact that many erotapocritic collections contain the same questions although in variant forms and sometimes with differing answers: no less than 19 of the 29 genuine QQ in this collection were already available in another form in Slavonic translation. Its contents are as follows:

¹⁶⁹ Viz. *codex Parisinus graecus* 922 of the eleventh century and *codex Escorialensis graecus* R III 2 of the fourteenth century; on the former see H. OMONT, *Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, 4 vols, Paris, 1886-1898, i, pp. 176-177, and БИБИКОВ, *Протомун* [see note 69], pp. 69-73, on the latter, which is a *codex descriptus* of the former, see A. REVILLA, *Catálogo de los Códices Griegos de la Biblioteca de El Escorial*, vol. 1, Madrid, 1936, pp. 141-150, and БИБИКОВ, *Протомун* [see note 69], pp. 88-90.

¹⁷⁰ The list of 45 manuscripts given by КУЕВ, *Иван* [see note 21], pp. 294-304, is unreliable as it includes manuscripts with QQ of the first translation of the florilegium, e.g. № 21, 22 and 34, not to mention the two manuscripts of the second translation, №№ 5 and 7.

¹⁷¹ Ed. КУЕВ, *Иван* [see note 21], pp. 304-321.

¹⁷² *Codex* 1498 in the collection of Yelpidifor Barsov, now in the State History Museum, Moscow, see *ibidem*, pp. 300-301. The manuscript has not been described and Kuev vaguely states that some of the QQ are missing because the manuscript is defective.

- Q 8 with an exegesis of Acts 10:35 on the fear of God, cf. Athanasian Q 101;
 Q 11 on reparation for sin, cf. Athanasian Q 84;
 Q 12 on the age from which an act can be considered a sin, cf. Timothy of Alexandria's *Responsa canonica* 18;
 Q 15 on whether day preceded night in creation, which involves the question whether Christ rose from the dead on the Sabbath, cf. Athanasian Q 53;
 Q 18 on spiritual dereliction, cf. Pseudo-Anastasian Q 9;
 Q 25 on fornication, cf. Pseudo-Anastasian Q 8;
 Q 98 on the use of the ephod for judgement [Exodus 28:6-12, 30], cf. Pseudo-Anastasian Q 40;
 Q 33 on the fate of a frequent sinner, cf. Pseudo-Anastasian Q 3;
 Q 34 on whether the Devil is the cause of sin;
 Q 6 on the worship of God in spirit and truth [John 4:24], cf. Pseudo-Anastasian Q 2;
 Q 29 on sudden death, cf. Pseudo-Anastasian Q 18;
 Q 30 on whether sudden death is the Devil's work, cf. Pseudo-Anastasian Q 18;
 Q 41 on the frequency of communion, cf. Pseudo-Anastasian Q 7;
 Q 43 on whether an executed murderer is forgiven;
 Q 45 on whether wealth is from God [Haggai 2:8], cf. Pseudo-Anastasian Q 11;
 Q 46 on condemnation for disobedience to God, cf. Timothy's *Responsa canonica* 17;
 Q 48 on the ways to salvation;
 Q 51 on fasting, cf. Pseudo-Anastasian Q 74 (64);¹⁷³
 Q 92 with an exegesis of 1 Corinthians 13:3 on love;
 Q 93 on whether the fire in 1 Corinthians 3:15 means hell;
 Q 94 on whether the life of the world has a fixed span;
 Q 95 with an exegesis of 1 Corinthians 15:28 on the subjection of the Son to the Father;
 Q 96 with an exegesis of Matthew 5:29 on plucking out an offensive eye, cf. Pseudo-Anastasian Q 70 (60);
 Q 99 with an exegesis of Romans 8:29 and 9:15 and 18 on predestination;
 Q 100 with an exegesis of Matthew 5:17 as not permitting polygamy, cf. Pseudo-Anastasian Q 139, which is not in the collection of 88 Pseudo-Anastasian QQ;¹⁷⁴
 Q 20 on the abode of dead souls, cf. Pseudo-Anastasian Q 19;
 Q 23 on whether paradise is corporeal or incorporeal, cf. Pseudo-Anastasian Q 23 and Athanasian Q 48;
 Q 59 on reconciliation with a friend who has insulted you, cf. Pseudo-Anastasian Q 109, which is also not in the collection of 88 Pseudo-Anastasian QQ;¹⁷⁵
 Q 101 on whether the evils visited on Christians by Arabs are God's will, cf. Pseudo-Anastasian Q 17.

In view of the great popularity of ἐρωταποκρίσεις and the similarity of their contents in the various collections it was inevitable that such mixed

¹⁷³ Where the number of the Q in the unpublished Greek collection of 88 Pseudo-Anastasian QQ varies from that in the collection of 154 QQ in PG 89, the number of the latter is given between brackets.

¹⁷⁴ Ed. PG 89, col. 792.

¹⁷⁵ Ed. PG 89, col. 761.

collections of genuine Anastasian and Athanasian questions should appear and in some cases they are very small, e.g. *codex Vindobonensis slavicus* 36, a fifteenth-century Serbian manuscript clearly copied from a Bulgarian exemplar, on ff. 118r-124r has a collection of 5 QQ ascribed to Anastasius which in fact begins with Athanasian Q 15 and ends with Anastasian Q app. 22.¹⁷⁶

Classical Greek erotapocritic works must be seen in the context of schools of philosophy with a tradition of debate and disputation, a tradition which survived to some extent in Byzantium but which was totally lacking among the Slavs. Indeed, until the seventeenth century classical Greek philosophy was taboo as it was pagan and no philosophical works were translated.¹⁷⁷ The Orthodox Slavs thus had no knowledge of the use of the genre by philosophers such as Aristotle, Plutarch or Porphyry or even of erotapocritic works by more serious Byzantine scholars, e.g. Photius' *Amphilochia*. This negative attitude towards 'pagan' philosophy only began to change towards the end of the seventeenth century when, for instance, a work containing some material from the pseudo-Aristotelian erotapocritic *Problemata* was translated in 1677.¹⁷⁸ For scholars interested in the influence of the erotapocritic works of classical Greek literature – as opposed to those of Christian literature – early Slavonic literature is thus clearly of minor importance since any classical influence was purely fortuitous via the intermediary of Byzantine erotapocritic literature.¹⁷⁹

The erotapocritic works translated for the Slavs had a purely didactic purpose: to propagate knowledge about every aspect of the faith and to supply answers to questions which might occur to the faithful. This brief survey should suffice to show that a broad range of Byzantine erotapocritic works was indeed available in Slavonic translation, not all popular unsystematic

¹⁷⁶ See КУЕВ, Иван [see note 21], p. 296; for Q app. 22 see RICHARD - MUNITIZ, *Anastasii* [see note 68], pp. 212-213.

¹⁷⁷ On the distorted East Slav perception of classical Antiquity until the seventeenth century see F. THOMSON, *The Distorted Mediaeval Russian Perception of Classical Antiquity: the Causes and the Consequences*, in A. WELKENHUYSEN - H. BRAET - W. VERBEKE (ed.), *Mediaeval Antiquity (Mediaevalia Lovaniensia, series I, Studia, 24)*, Leuven, 1995, pp. 303-364.

¹⁷⁸ The title reads in translation: "*Problems, that is, Various Questions from the Writings of the Great Philosopher Aristotle and Other Wise Men (...)*". It is a translation of a work by Andrzej Glaber, published in Polish at Cracow in 1535 and again in 1610, which contains matter taken not only from Aristotle's *Problemata* but also from works by or ascribed to Albertus Magnus, Avicenna, Galen and others. Glaber's book was not all his own work as it is based on the second edition (Ulm, 1500) of a German version first published at Augsburg in 1492; for more details see THOMSON, *Perception* [see note 177], p. 317.

¹⁷⁹ However, as pointed out above with reference to Pseudo-Caesarius' *Quaestiones*, some early Slavonic translations were clearly made from much earlier Greek codices and can provide valuable evidence when weighting Greek variants.

collections but also systematic ones devoted to particular subjects such as Biblical exegesis, theology, spirituality, monasticism and canon law, not to mention anti-Latin and anti-Jewish polemics. The importance of the role played by this translated erotapocritic literature in the Slav reception of Christianity and Byzantine culture should not be underestimated since not only did early Slav literature contain many translations of erotapocritic works but their influence also permeated it at every level. The translated collections in turn not only served as the basis for the compilation by Slavs of new collections made up of combinations of ἐρωταποκρίσεις taken from various sources but also inspired the compilation of original Slav erotapocritic works, some of them serious, for instance, the letters of Patriarch Euthymius of Bulgaria (c.1375-after 1393) to Abbot Nicodemus of St Anthony's monastery at Tismana in Wallachia (c.1385-1406/7),¹⁸⁰ but many of them insignificant, not to say trivial, which by the fourteenth century had come to occupy a prominent place in popular culture, a fascinating subject which, however, exceeds the scope of this survey.¹⁸¹

Francis J. THOMSON

francis.thomson@uantwerpen.be

¹⁸⁰ Ed. E. KALUŽNIACKI, *Werke des Patriarchen von Bulgarien Euthymius (1375-1393) nach den besten Handschriften*, Vienna, 1901, pp. 205-224. Much remains to be done in the field of Slavonic translations of Greek erotapocritic works, to give but two examples: the fourteenth-century Bulgarian nomocanon which contains the fourth translation of Timothy of Alexandria's *Responsa canonica*, see above note 48, also contains an acephalous collection of 85 ἐρωταποκρίσεις, some long, others short. It begins with the question: "Why do we Christians bow to the east but the Jews to the south?" It includes some Pseudo-Anastasian QQ but its other sources have not been established, see the facsimile edition of the manuscript by КРЪСТЕВ, *Номоканон* [see note 48], ff. 1r-29r. Another collection of 77 QQ falsely ascribed to Gregory the Divine, viz. of Nazianzus, has been edited on the basis of fifteenth-century *codex* 122 in the collection of the Trinity Laura of St Sergius, ff. 155r-195r, by Н. НИКОЛЬСКИЙ, *О литературных трудах митрополита Климента Смолятича, писателя XII в.*, Санкт-Петербург, 1892, pp. 161-199. It is a Slav compilation whose sources include Pseudo-Anastasius Sinaita, John Chrysostom, John Damascene, Nikon of the Black Mount and Theodoret of Cyrhus but as yet not all of its sources have been established.

¹⁸¹ МИЛТЕНОВА, *Erotapokriseis* [see note 162], *passim*, is an excellent study of such Slavonic erotapocritic collections, six of which are edited in appendices, see pp. 354-516.

SUMMARY

The significant role which erotapocritic literature played in the reception of Byzantine culture by the Slavs is shown by a survey of the Slavonic translations in the fields of theology, both doctrinal and polemic, exegesis, monasticism, spirituality, morality, hagiography. Because of their importance special attention is paid to the translations of collections of both Anastasius Sinaita's *Interrogationes* and *responsiones* and pseudo-Anastasian collections with their accompanying prefaces and appendices, which were eminently suitable for the instruction of the new converts.